This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Tappan Presbyterian Association
LIBRARY

Presented by HON. D. BETHUNE DUFFIELD,
From Library of Rev. Geo. Duffield, D.D.

548609

Geo Duffield

A.M.

tio sylva.

BT
265
.W74

The history in these pages, is much of it the views of a prejudiced writer suggested by a very imperfect examination of colloquial reports as to the sentiments of some of his contemporaries, tho a great deal of it deserves credence

[illegible]

A

HISTORICAL SKETCH

OF

OPINIONS;

Together with

TRANSLATIONS

FROM

FRANCIS TURRETTIN,

ON

THE ATONEMENT.

A

HISTORICAL SKETCH

OF

OPINIONS ON THE ATONEMENT,

INTERSPERSED WITH

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES

OF THE

LEADING DOCTORS,

AND

OUTLINES OF THE SECTIONS OF THE CHURCH,

From the Incarnation of Christ, to the present time;

WITH

Translations from Francis Turrettin,

ON

THE ATONEMENT.

BY JAMES R. WILLSON, A. M.

DANIEL IX. 26. יכרת משיח ואין לו

Ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν.—ROMANS IV. 25.

PHILADELPHIA:
PUBLISHED BY EDWARD EARLE, NO. 145, CHESNUT STREET.
W. Fry, Printer.
1817.

District of Pennsylvania, to wit:

SEAL.

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the fifteenth day of May, in the forty-first year of the independence of the United States of America, A. D. 1817, James R. Willson, A M of the said district, hath deposited in this office the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as author, in the words following, to wit:

"A Historical Sketch of Opinions on the Atonement, interspersed with Biographical Notices of the Leading Doctors, and outlines of the sections of the church, from the incarnation of Christ, to the present time; with Translations from Francis Turrettin, on the Atonement By James R. Willson, A M. Daniel ix. 26 כרת משיח ואין לו Ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τα παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, και ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαιωσιν ἡμῶν. Romans iv. 25.

In conformity to the act of the Congress of the United States, entituled, "An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned," and also to the act, entitled, "An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies during the times therein mentioned," and extended the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints."

D. CALDWELL, *Clerk of the District of Pennsylvania.*

Gift
Tappan Presb. Ass.
1-11-1932

REV. ALEXANDER M'LEOD, D. D.

REV. AND DEAR FRIEND,

MOTIVES of personal friendship, respect, and obligation, together with public considerations, induce me to inscribe this volume to you.

The aid derived from your instructions in the prosecution of my literary, and theological studies, imposes obligations to esteem and gratitude, which render it proper that this essay, in defence of truth, should be inscribed to a friend and preceptor.

It is fit too, that an attempt to promote correct views of the Atonement, should be dedicated to one, who from the pulpit, and the press, and in private life, has exhibited the truth, and efficacy of this fundamental article of the Christian's faith and hope. The church has also appreciated the worth of your Ecclesiastical Catechism, which displays accurate and lucid views of the government and discipline of God's house;—of your Sermons on the Headship of Messiah over the Nations, on the Rights of Humanity, which have been so often, so long, and so grossly outraged, on the Ministry of Reconciliation, on the late War, and on the Life and Power of True Godliness;—and of your Lectures on the Revelations, unfolding from the prophetic scriptures, the past and present state of the Church of God, in relation to the empires of the earth; her future prospects; and the subserviency of all national movements, under the govern-

ment of the Redeemer, to her interests. All these, together with your instrumentality in causing our New Testament Zion, "to lengthen her cords, strengthen her stakes, and stretch out the curtains of her habitation," connect your name with the history of the church, by a tie that can never be broken, so long as her records are preserved.

That your useful life may be long spared;—that you may have health to complete the various theological works, which you contemplate;—that you may long continue to be a blessing to "the flock of God, over whom the Holy Ghost has made you an overseer;" and that, "in a good old age you may be gathered to your fathers in peace," is the earnest prayer of

Your ever very sincere,

And affectionate friend,

J. R. WILLSON.

Philadelphia, May 6th, 1817.

PREFACE.

THERE is a general agitation of the church, at the present time, in consequence of false views of the doctrine of the atonement. This subject just now excites peculiar attention in the American churches. Every city, every district, and almost every village, where there are any members of the family of God, is disturbed by a spirit of controversy. This were deeply to be regretted, by every pious disciple of Jesus, did we not know that however precious peace may be, truth is more precious.

The work now presented to the reader consists of two parts, Historical Sketches, and a Translation. In the Historial Sketches, the author has been advised by some, whose counsel deserves attention, to deal very gently with errorists. Nothing would have better accorded with his feelings, could he have believed that truth would be as effectually promoted by pursuing this course. This he could not believe. The Apostles and Reformers thought and acted differently from such counsellors. He has also been advised, by those on whose opinions he placed more reliance, to speak out with boldness and candor. He has done so. Whatever the "friends of moderation" may think, he hopes he shall never regret what he has done. We should know men as well as doctrines, and under this conviction, he has not spared to mention names and churches freely. Those who are advancing require gentleness. Those who are departing from the truth merit even severity.

He has not knowingly withheld, through fear or favour, any important fact, or wilfully perverted or discoloured any. Yet with all the pains he could take, mistakes may

have crept into his pages. When pointed out, if they exist, they will be corrected with great cheerfulness. To find the opinions of any man, or of any section of the church, better than he has thought them, will give him great pleasure.

In the translations from Turrettin, the translator has aimed at no more than to render the reasoning of his author perspicuous. In this he hopes he has succeeded. Many have attempted to translate parts of this system, but no one has before published, so far as the translator knows, any of his translations. Could he have availed himself of a version into German, French, or Italian, it would have assisted him much. But as none such is known to exist, he has been compelled to rely upon the original alone. The scholastic mode of reasoning, adopted by Turrettin, has not been followed. It has been thought sufficient to give the sense, without copying the phraseology.

The doctrines taught by the Genevan school, he believes, will bear the severest examination, when brought to the "Law and the Testimony." They have been blessed by God for the promotion of personal piety, and will yet be blessed for that end.

That both the reader and the writer of the following pages may have an interest in the atonement, which they are designed to defend, and may enjoy its fruits, through the tender mercy of the "Author and Finisher of our faith," in mansions of glory, is the earnest prayer of the

AUTHOR.

Philadelphia, May 6, 1817.

HISTORICAL SKETCH, &c.

AT the time of Christ's appearance in the flesh, the great body of the Jewish doctors, as well as the common people, appear to have had very indistinct and inaccurate conceptions of the way in which salvation is to be attained by man. Instead of regarding the sacrifices offered up under the Jewish dispensation, as designed to direct their attention to Messiah, and fix their faith upon him, and as teaching them to found all their hopes of pardon upon his obedience and sufferings; they built their expectations of redemption, immediately upon the rigid observance of the precepts of the Mosaic ritual. Lest this might be somewhere deficient, they had recourse to another expedient. The Rabbins affirmed, that while Moses was in the Mount, God delivered to him, beside that law which was written out, a great number of precepts, to be delivered orally to Joshua, and the priests. They even taught, that these precepts were more holy than those which are contained in the written law. This they gave as the reason why Moses was prohibited from writing them. They were too sacred for the eyes of the vulgar. This oral law, the Rabbins declared, had been transmitted in all its original purity and perfection, from priest to priest, until it had reached themselves, who were then its venerable repositories. Hence it was called, "*the traditions of the elders.*" By the doctors, it was detailed to the ignorant and deluded multitude. The duties which this law, clothed with such imaginary dignity, prescribed, were no more than a multitude of solemn trifles; such as to wash cups and platters, not to eat with unwashen hands, &c. A strict attention to these unmeaning and foolish ceremonies, was esteemed by these ignorant teachers and besotted people, of more importance, and more meritorious in the sight

of God, than the fulfilment of the great and solemn duties of religion and morality, enjoined in the law and the prophets. With this blind and unmeaning attention to things so insignificant, Christ reproaches the scribes and pharisees:* "Woe unto you scribes, pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tythe of mint, and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. Ye blind guides, who strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Woe unto you scribes, pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess." Christ also charges them with setting aside the law of God, by their blind devotion to this traditionary law. †"Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your traditions." "Ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your traditions."

Labouring under such a blind attachment to the senseless commands of an ignorant and hypocritical priesthood, it is impossible they could have had any accurate views of that infinitely valuable atoning sacrifice of Christ, which was typically exhibited in the offering of the blood of bulls and of goats, and which was shortly to be offered up by the great high priest of our profession. It seems indeed that they were utterly ignorant of it. With this shameful ignorance Caiaphas, their own high priest, upbraids them. ‡"And one of them, named Caiaphas, being high priest that same year, said unto them, ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." Thus this priest, speaking by divine inspiration, not only reproved their ignorance, but instructed them in the nature and objects of the death of Christ. He was to die for Israel, that they might by his death, be freed from that destruction, which otherwise avenging justice would cause to fall upon them.

* Matt. xxiii. 23—25. † Matt. xv. 3. 6. ‡ John xi. 50.

Among these blind and carnal Jews, the opposition to the atonement, and pleading the value of good works, as meriting salvation, commenced. Among the instructions which Christ tendered to that degenerate and ungrateful people, the lessons which he delivered on the objects of his mission relative to the expiatory nature of his death and sufferings, and his reproofs calculated to turn them from their doctrinal and practical errors on this subject, hold a conspicuous place. But their obstinacy was immoveable; the darkness which enveloped their understandings tangible, and their ignorance invincible. All the salutary instructions which he gave them, they ignorantly or maliciously perverted. When he spoke of his death and resurrection, under the metaphor of throwing down and rebuilding a temple; they extracted out of this an accusation; they represented him as having proudly boasted, that were the Jewish temple thrown down, he would rebuild it in three days. The Apostles also directed their heaviest artillery against the strong holds in which the Jews had entrenched themselves, relative to the atonement. It appears that many of the Jewish converts, after they were proselyted to the faith of the gospel, still retained those false views, which, relative to the merit of good works, they had imbibed from the Jewish doctors. Some of these doctors, who embraced Jesus as the true Messiah, taught in Rome, about the middle of the first century, that good works were meritorious, that they ought to be depended upon for salvation. Their opinions on this subject, however, made very little progress among the gentile converts. Though the controversy was agitated with a degree of warmth proportioned to the importance of the subject in discussion, yet it appears to have been of short duration.

One grand object which the apostle Paul had in view, in the epistle to the Hebrews, was to remove the dangerous prejudices, which the Jewish proselytes had imbibed from their legal teachers, on this cardinal doctrine of the christian system; and to deliver a lucid view of the nature of Christ's priesthood; and to establish on an immoveable basis the glorious and consolatory truth of the atonement. So

irresistible are the evidences which that apostle adduces, in favour of this doctrine, that Priestley, one of the most learned of the Socinian doctors of the last century, charges the author of the epistle to the Hebrews with inaccuracy, in his reasoning on the priestly office, and expiatory offering of Christ.

It was probably the epistle which this apostle wrote to the christians in Rome, that excited the Jewish Rabbins to enter the lists of controversy. On the insufficiency of our own good works, for our justification, nothing can be more decisive than the epistle to the Romans. There can be no doubt but that the influence which it had over the minds of the christians at Rome, prevented the legal doctrines of the Jewish doctors from spreading, and finally put an end to the controversy.

Those writers, who flourished in the church from the age of the apostles, till some time in the fifth century, have been denominated fathers. The distance at which we are placed from the times in which they wrote, our difficulty in procuring accurate information relative to the controversies which then disturbed the peace of the church, and our ignorance of the precise sense, at that time affixed to various words, used in those polemical discussions, render it, in some instances, almost impossible to ascertain with accuracy, their opinions on some of the most important doctrines of the christian system. It may also be added, that they often express their ideas with less perspicuity than we could wish. Hence it has happened that in many theological controversies of latter ages, each of the parties employed in managing these debates has attempted, and sometimes with the appearance of success, to entrench themselves behind the authority of the ancient fathers. We are anxious to learn what opinions generally prevailed in those ages, which were so near the days of Christ, and his apostles; as we naturally and rationally think that the great body of christians, then, were less likely to fall into error, than those who are more remote from the times in which the founders of the christian church lived. But in addition to the difficulties before

enumerated, it ought not to be forgotten, that there are many articles of the christian religion, which the early fathers have scarcely touched upon in any of their works. Their passing over these doctrines in silence, or bestowing upon them no more than a passing notice, arose from the objects on which they employed their pens. They rarely or rather never attempted a systematic elucidation of the truths of the christian system. A great part of their labours were devoted to the defence of revealed religion against the impious attacks of infidels, who, at a very early period unmasked all their batteries against the Bible. Another field in which they signalised themselves, was that wherein they attacked, and triumphantly repelled the numerous errors, and heresies, that early invaded the church. In each of these conflicts they wielded the arms of truth with great effect, and acquired for themselves a title to the admiration of all succeeding ages. But it is manifest from the circumstances, which called forth their talents as writers, that when any article of their creed, was not assailed, a full display of their views on that article is not to be expected. After all, it would be strange, if they had attached to the doctrine of the atonement as much importance in the work of man's salvation, as the great body of modern protestant divines have done, and yet had passed it by in total silence. They have not done so. On the contrary, they have transmitted to us their most decisive testimony in favour of this great truth; and that in a voice loud enough, and in a language perspicuous enough, to be heard and understood, at this remote period; distant from them seventeen or eighteen hundred years.

Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho a Jew,* when speaking of the death of Christ says: "This is the laver of salvation which those who repent obtain; the sins of those who repent are not now expiated by the blood of goats and sheep, by the ashes of an heifer, nor by such oblations, but through faith, by the blood and death of Christ, who died

* Page 177.

for that purpose; as Isaiah saith, &c." Here the father plainly maintains the doctrine of the atonement. When he asserts that expiation is not now made by the offering of victims, such as were sacrificed under the Jewish economy, and that the object of Christ's death and sufferings was to make expiation, he must necessarily include the atonement, which is embraced in expiation. He elsewhere * clearly asserts that the curse due to sinners was laid upon Christ. "If therefore," says he, "God the father of the families of the universe, appointed his son to take upon himself the curse of the whole human family, knowing that crucified and dead, he would raise him up, &c." The curse is used in this place, by a common figure of speech for the effects of the curse. The expression, "whole human family," which this, and other fathers use when treating of the atonement, is explained by themselves in other places to mean, that "Christ died sufficiently for all men, and efficiently, for the elect." This still is an obscure mode of stating their views relative to the extent of the atonement. I understand them to mean; that had God destined the death of Christ for the salvation of every individual of the human family, its value was adequate to such an extensive object; but that however valuable the atonement of Christ may be, yet the elect only will be saved by it, as God has limited its efficiency to them.

It appears, from Justin's introducing these remarks in favour of the atonement, into a work professedly written against the Jews, that this degraded and apostate people were the great enemies of the atonement, at that time.

Justin Martyr, flourished about the middle of the second century; less than one hundred years after the days of the apostles. He was at first a Pagan philosopher. In the celebrated Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean, and Platonic schools of philosophy, he sought with ardour, for satisfactory views of the divine character. He was disappointed. In the christian religion he found that light which he desired, embraced the faith of the gospel, and became one of its ablest advo-

* Page 252.

cates; united himself to the church, and was one of its brightest ornaments. The doctrine of the atonement, which many professors of christianity consider as offering indignity to the divine character, was no obstacle to Justin's embracing the gospel. He was a man distinguished for his ardent piety, and possessed a considerable share of the most valuable learning of that age. As he lived so near the days of the apostles, and as he was not in his own time charged by any christian with having erroneous views of the atonement, it must be admitted, even by its enemies, that there is the greatest probability of his holding, on this subject, the doctrines taught by the apostles, and generally embraced in the church.

At the instigation of Crescens, a cynic philosopher, he was persecuted to the death, and has been hence called the martyr. *

Tertullian, a native of Carthage, who lived in the latter part of the second century, in a book which he wrote against the Jews, maintains the doctrine of the atonement. He says that "Christ, was lead as a lamb to the slaughter, was dumb as a sheep before its shearers, that he might become a sacrifice for all nations."† Tertullian was a man of warm, and vigorous imagination, and in many instances permitted his imagination to lead his judgment aside from the path of truth. The doctrine of the atonement, however, was one of too sacred a nature for even the imagination of Tertullian to meddle with. This remark may also be made with respect to Origen, who, in the beginning of the third century, distinguished himself not only by his great learning, research, and zeal in diffusing among the nations a knowledge of the religion of Jesus, but also by his corrupting many of its doctrines, and mixing with them extravagant fancies, borrowed from the Platonic philosophy. He was principal of the Alexandrian school: and on a journey to Achaia, was ordained a presbyter by the bishops of Cesarea and Jerusalem. His opinions were condemned in two councils,

* Mosheim's ecclesiastical history, v. i. † Lib. adversus Judios, c. 13.

and in the latter, he was degraded from his office. Yet with all his great fondness for innovation, he never presumed to deny, or even new-model the received doctrine of the church, relative to the atonement. On the contrary, he clearly and expressly maintains the doctrine of Christ's having been offered up as an atoning sacrifice. "If," says he, * "sin had not entered into the world, there would have been no need for the Son of God to become a lamb; nor would it have been necessary that he should become flesh in order to his being crucified, but he would have remained what he was from the beginning, God the Word. However, as sin has entered into the world, of necessity there must be a propitiation for sin; a propitiation cannot be made without a victim: hence there must be provided a victim for sin." In his comment upon Matthew, chapter 16, he says: "Man indeed can give nothing in exchange for his soul, but God can, even the precious blood of his Son; for we are not bought with corruptible things, such as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of an immaculate lamb."

Had it been the received doctrine of the church in the age of Origen, that men are to be saved by the merit of their own good works, and that Christ did not die to make a propitiation for our sins, but only to set an example of holiness and patience; the doctrine taught in these passages would have been esteemed heresy. Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, was a violent enemy of Origen; called councils, and had him condemned. Would Demetrius have failed to charge Origen with holding heretical opinions relative to the atonement, if he had departed from the faith of the church in a point of such importance? Certainly not. As we hear nothing of a charge of heresy relative to the atonement, brought against this father, notwithstanding the great interest, and violent dissentions, which he and his peculiar tenets excited in the church, we may warrantably conclude, that the doctrines which he taught on that subject, were the doctrines of the church in that age. This conclusion is at

* Homil. iv. in Numer.

least fair with respect to the church in Egypt. We have still farther evidence, that the doctrine of the atonement was embraced by the African churches. It is distinctly taught by Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who was for a part of his life contemporary with Origen. Cyprian was a profound and elegant scholar, his eloquence was flowing and persuasive, and his piety ardent and exalted. This great and good man was crowned with martyrdom in the year 258.*

"Christ," says this father, "bore us all, and it is he who bore our sins."† In his work on the passion of Christ, addressing himself to our Redeemer, he passionately exclaims, "Pilate declared that in thee, there was no cause of death. Caiaphas, as he was high priest that year, prophesied that thy death should satisfy for the sins of a people unfriendly to thee." Again he says, "no remedy could be found for our original death unless in the death of Christ, nor was it possible to reconcile to God condemned exiles, by any offering, unless by the glorious sacrifice of the blood of Christ." Thus it appears as far as we have the means of ascertaining, at this distant period, that, except by a few Judaizing teachers, the doctrine of the divine atonement was not called in question, during three hundred years from the birth of Christ. The primitive christians rejoiced in the consolation which this truth is calculated to impart, to all who are sensible of their weakness, and who in good earnest seek for salvation.

From Africa, let us direct our view to Judea, the fountain of gospel truth, both in old and new testament times. There we find the doctors of the church, teaching the same doctrine of the atonement, which we found were taught in other regions. Eusebius Pamphilus, bishop of Cesarea, the justly celebrated ecclesiastical historian, gives, without any equivocation his suffrage in favour of this scriptural doctrine of atonement. When speaking of the way in which sinners are restored to the divine favour, he says: ‡"the

* Mosheim, vol. i. † Epis. 63. ad. Cecil parag. 9. lib. x.
‡ De Demonstra. Evangel. c. i.

lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world was made a curse for us. God made him to be sin for us, although he knew no sin; he was constituted a Saviour, through being substituted in the room of us all, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." He says again, "Not only does the lamb of God effect these things, but he is also made the author of the pardon of our sins, by suffering in our stead, that punishment which he had not deserved, but which we had merited by the multitude of our sins. Christ suffered death in our room, and took upon himself the pains, distresses, and ignominy which were due to us, and, transferring from us to himself the curse, which was suspended over us, he was made a curse for us."

Such are the opinions of Eusebius on this subject. They were doubtless embraced in his day, by the greater part, probably by all christians in Judea. This learned and great man lived in the time of Constantine the great, and was a special favorite with that prince. Ancient christian writers, bear the most ample testimony in his favour. They speak of him as a great and good man, and pious bishop. Indeed, he needs not their eulogies to convince posterity of his worth. His own works, which have come down to our times, especially the work from which the above quotations are made, and his church history, hold up a portrait of his character, the features of which, no competent, and unprejudiced judge can mistake. It has, indeed, become fashionable, in our times, even among those who call themselves christians, to depreciate not only the character of Eusebius, but of the whole christian church in his time. That happy time which the spirit of prophecy designates as half an hour of rest and peace in the church, which all commentators admit was the time of Constantine, is fixed upon by some, as a time of the most boundless depravity. One would have expected to find all true christians, unite in blessing God for the events which then took place. Then it was that the glorious gospel of God vanquished the Roman empire, and, in some respects, broke in pieces the great image spoken of in Daniel, and filled the whole earth. Then princes upon their

thrones and in their palaces, were not ashamed to acknowledge themselves the disciples of Jesus. A comparison between those and our times, will furnish us with a reason for the aversion which worldly minded professors manifest to the church in the days of her triumph. That events took place in that period which are greatly to be deplored, cannot be questioned. That Constantine, who was made the instrument in the hand of providence, to introduce the christian religion to the throne of the Cæsars, was a man of genuine piety, rests upon testimony very equivocal. His views of church order and of the doctrine of grace were at least very imperfect. He was more ambitious of his own glory, than to promote the welfare of the church of God, and the interests of truth and holiness: He modelled the government of the church after the forms of civil order in the empire, and assumed to himself the supreme government of the church, which a faithless or misguided bishop delivered into his hands without one effort to preserve the independence of the judicatories of God's house. Thus there were entailed upon the church, miseries under which she yet groans.

But of all the evils which date their rise from that period, none are more to be deplored than those which arose from the corruption or denial of the doctrine of the atonement. Before that time no one who had any claim to be a disciple of Jesus, had dared to deny this fundamental article of the christian faith. Celsus who vehemently attacked the Holy Scriptures as a fiction, imposed upon the world for truth, had masked the doctrine of atonement. But he was an infidel. No error indeed, of any great consequence, had disturbed the peace of Zion, without assailing in some point this doctrine. In the time of Constantine it was totally denied; or at least a foundation was laid for its entire rejection, by a sect who called themselves christians. This sect arose in Alexandria in Egypt.

There had existed in the church, from an early period, considerable variety of opinion, relative to the doctrine of the trinity. The Sabellians denied that there are three persons

in the Godhead, and held the opinion that the Deity acts in three capacities: that as Father, he plans the work of man's salvation, as Son, accomplishes it, and as Holy Spirit, applies it for the actual redemption of sinners. This doctrine was condemned by the church as heretical. A great majority of the christian bishops, while they believed in a trinity of persons and unity of essence, considered the doctrine a mystery beyond human comprehension, and contented themselves generally with the use of the very words of scripture, in stating their views.

In an assembly held at Alexandria, Arius, one of the presbyters, a turbulent man, denied that the Son, or Christ Jesus, was of the essence of the Father, and affirmed that the doctrine which he opposed, was nearly allied to the Sabellian heresy. He did not stop here. He boldly asserted that the Son was not a divine person, that he was a mere creature, which Godhad created before any other, and that he possessed only an angelic nature, more exalted in power or intellect than any other created intelligence. Thus did this man open a fountain from which copious streams of error and heresy have flowed in all succeeding ages. The rejection of Messiah's atonement, was necessarily a part of the system of Arius. If Christ was a mere creature, he must like all other creatures, be subject to the law for himself, and so his fulfilment of its precepts could not be imputed to fallen sinners for their justification. Error is congenial to the depraved heart of man. The heresy of Arius was soon embraced by great numbers of professors in the African churches, and in the neighbouring Asiatic churches; and a flame of dissention was lighted up, which fifteen centuries have not been able to extinguish.

Vigorous exertions were made by the friends of truth to check the progress of these baleful heresies. A general council was summoned and met in 325, at Nice in Bythinia. The council was well attended. Many of the members endeavoured to defend the tenets of Arius. But they were condemned, and Arius himself banished. At this council

was formed the famous Nicene creed, in which it is asserted that the Son is consubstantial, or of the same essence with the Father. The object of the council, in forming this creed, was to draw a distinct line of demarkation between the heretical and the orthodox. They believed that the dogmas of the turbulent Egyptian, were utterly subversive of the very foundations of the christian system, and tore away every pillar upon which the building of mercy is erected. They were strangers to that pretended liberality, which mingles heresy and truth in one mass of disorder, and renders the church a scene of confusion, more confounded than that at the tower of Babel. Every minister of religion was ordered, under pain of the church's highest censure, to sign the creed. Errorists and heretics were generally as pliable in that age as they have been since. Many signed the creed, but did not renounce the heresy. This council was called and the proceedings sanctioned by the emperor Constantine, the great.

All the power of the church and state thus exerted, did not avail to root out and destroy the Arian heresies. Arius continued with the most indefatigable zeal to propagate his doctrines among the Illyrians, to whose country he had been banished; and had his efforts been confined to that region, the evil would not have been so deplorable. He, and his friends, found means to gain the imperial favour. Constantine, who recalled Arius from banishment, embraced his heresy, and reinstated him in his dignities.

The opposition made by the bishops of the church to the opinions of Arius, the extraordinary agitation into which the church was thrown by their promulgation, their condemnation by a general council, and the creed framed by the same council, prove incontestably that they were new. Had they been, previously to that time, the commonly received opinions of the church, it is utterly impossible that the avowal of them, in the assembly of Alexandria, could have procured such a general excitement. Their novelty, as well as their destructive tendency alarmed the church, which would probably have purged herself effectually of

these monstrous corruptions, had it not been for the unholy and tyrannical interference of the emperor.

The high favour into which Arius was taken by Constantine, and the adoption of his heresies by that prince, greatly hastened the corruption of the church, in relation to her worship, discipline and government. All nations have had sacrifices. A sense of the imperfections of their works, and a sense of their sins, have taught them that some other means than those of their own good works, must be resorted to, in order to secure the favour of Heaven. As Arianism, comprehending a denial of the doctrine of atonement, became the religion of the imperial court, and consequently fashionable, a reliance upon the merit of good works was the only expedient for procuring the pardon of sin, and the favour of Heaven. This was soon found to be inadequate. Hence originated a prodigious number of superstitious observances. This heresy as well as all others, cools the ardour of devotion, and diminishes the love of professing christians for God; thus a pompous worship must be established to excite the admiration of the gaping multitude. A general profligacy of manners, both among the faithless priesthood who ministered at the altar, and among the laity soon followed. All these paved the way, and accelerated the approach of the "man of sin" and "mystery of iniquity" who made his appearance in all his ghostly honours in the year 606, when Phocas emperor of Constantinople, completed, by declaring Gregory, bishop of Rome, universal head of the church, what Constantine had begun.

From that period, and indeed for a considerable time before, the hopes of salvation possessed by many nominal christians, were not placed in the righteousness of Messiah; but in penances, monastic seclusion, the benedictions of cunning and avaricious priests, and the minute observance of an endless variety of childish, unmeaning, or vitious ceremonies. When men cease to look to God for salvation, they must have recourse to other means, of their own foolish invention, to appease the clamours of a guilty conscience. The whole history of the Roman Catholic

church, from the days of Constantine, to the commencement of the reformation in Germany, affords ample illustration and confirmation of this truth.

The persecutions which the christians endured under the reign of the Cæsars, before the empire became christian, drove many of the most excellent and faithful of the servants of Heaven, into the valleys of the Alps, where, in worldly poverty, they enjoyed in its pristine purity, the religion of the bible. There they worshipped Christ as God. There they reposed in the hope of a blessed immortality, founded upon the glorious atoning sacrifice of the Son of God. There they lived in peace, far from the heresies, idolatries, heathenish ceremonies, and other corruptions, which deformed and degraded the great national churches of the remainder of Europe.

The history of this excellent people is little known. They were not numbered among the nations. We know however, that on the doctrine of the atonement and other capital articles of the christian system, they did not depart from the ancient purity and simplicity of gospel truth. For nearly one thousand years they lived in a great measure unnoticed and unknown. They were discovered by the Roman pontiff and his satellites in the thirteenth century. A warlike spirit had been awakened during the preceding centuries, when all the power of Europe had directed its energies against the Turks of Asia. This military spirit and power were governed by fanaticism, and by a blind and furious zeal. With a view to exterminate those friends of peace and truth from the face of the earth, a crusade was proclaimed against them by Innocent III; and from that date they had no rest. The fury of their adversaries poured itself upon them, like the resistless torrent from their native mountain sides. They were no warriors. They were soon scattered into all the kingdoms of Europe. Persecution followed them, wherever they fled. In Bohemia, where they were collected in great numbers, the rage of persecution was peculiarly furious. Long they resisted, but were compelled at last to yield. The Bohemian brethren, rejected all other

ground of hope for salvation, than the atoning sacrifice of Christ Jesus. Priestly indulgences, priestly pardon, priestly penances, priestly masses and priestly ceremonies, were not the means to which the Waldenses, and Bohemian christians resorted to obtain the absolution of their sins. They looked to God himself for pardon through the blood of his Son. This struck at the root of the papal corruption, wealth and power, and irritated to the highest pitch the wrath of the see of Rome. These commotions awakened a spirit of inquiry and general excitation, and a general council was called. It was composed of Roman catholic clergy. Before it appeared John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, two of the most distinguished advocates for the truth. Their eloquent defence, especially that of Jerome, astonished all who heard it, and challenged the applause even of their adversaries. But it could not save them. The fire had been kindled before, and they were marked out as victims to be offered up. By an order of this sanguinary council, they were led to the stake, and died martyrs to the truth of the atonement. This took place early in the sixteenth century.

The crushing of the Bohemian armies and the cutting off of the most distinguished divines by the sword, did not destroy the cause in which they were engaged. It provoked discussion and opened the eyes of thousands to the corruptions which had for ages been accumulating in the church. All these, or nearly all, may be traced to erroneous views of the atonement, and of the person and character of him by whom it was made. Long the pilgrimages, the penances, the ceremonies, &c. prescribed by the priests were thought to be sufficient to procure pardon. Some doubt, however, existed. Other means, or additional supports must be devised, to secure the confidence of the multitude, and assure them that their salvation was safe. Confession of sin to the priests, and their granting of pardon, had been practised for many ages. At first these pardons were attempted to be justified on the ground of the commission given by Christ to his disciples; and as an auxiliary to fortify such a stretch of power, the doctrine relative to works of supererogation was in-

vented. The substance of this monstrous invention, was that many saints by their fastings, pilgrimages, penances, prayers, benefactions to the church, &c. had done much more than was necessary to their own personal justification. These works were termed, "works of supererogation," which taken together, it was pretended, formed an extensive fund of merit, deposited in the hands of priests. When any one applied for absolution, so much of the stock was measured out to him as the priest thought sufficient to ensure his pardon, which he pronounced accordingly. But these corrupters of the religion of Jesus, did not stop here. Not only did they arrogate to themselves the right to remit past sins, they also professed to have a right to grant dispensations to commit them with impunity. These were called "indulgences." A scale was graduated, by which they measured the amount of the sin to be committed, and the price to be paid for the license. A privilege to commit the very highest crimes might be purchased. These indulgences constituted a source of extraordinary profit to the Roman pontiffs and their dependants, and missionaries were appointed and sent out into the various kingdoms of Europe, to sell them on commission, for the see of Rome.

No empire was more infested with these harpies than Germany. The most distinguished of them was John Tetzel, and Germany was his field of operation. He extolled, with the most pompous declamation, the merit and efficacy of indulgences, and in the warmth of his zeal he declared that they were more efficacious than the merits of Christ Jesus. The kings of Europe, as well as the petty princes, were indignant at the impositions that were thus practised upon their subjects, by means of which the bishop of Rome laid their states under such heavy contributions, as exhausted their wealth. But so potent was the spell which bound princes and emperors to the car of the pontiff, that few of them dared to prohibit the sale of indulgences in their dominions. As the evil had originated in the church, from the bosom of the church the remedy proceeded. The spirit of enquiry which was diffused over Europe, by the persecuted chris-

tians, who had fled from the Alps, had become too bold, to permit such absurd and extravagant pretensions to pass without examination.

It was in Switzerland, that a spirit of free enquiry, leading to important and glorious results, first manifested itself. There can be no doubt that this circumstance was in a great measure owing to the local position of that republic, in the neighborhood of those valleys where truth for many ages had found a place of refuge. The most distinguished of the divines who carried on their enquiries with freedom and boldness was Zuinglius. In the beginning of the sixteenth century, this excellent man dared to call in question the power of the catholic priests to forgive sin, and maintained that our iniquities are pardoned only in consequence of the atoning sacrifice of Christ Jesus, received by faith for our justification. Not long after the Swiss reformer erected the standard of truth upon the Alps, the impostures of the missionaries, whom the pontiff had sent into Germany to sell indulgences, were the occasion of bringing to light a very extraordinary man, destined of God to be a principal instrument in effecting the most beneficent revolution that the world has experienced since the days of the apostles—a man of great learning, uncommon zeal, ardent piety, and an intrepidity, that set at defiance the whole power of the Roman pontiff, though supported by all the crowned heads of Europe—a man who thought with so much freedom and boldness as to call in question opinions which for ages had been held most sacred, and the renunciation of which was thought by whole empires, to lead to inevitable perdition. I mean Martin Luther. He was born at Eisleben in Germany, was educated for the church, and took orders among the Austin monks. In his cell he found a portion of the New Testament in Greek, which he read with care. It awakened in him a desire to study the sacred scriptures in the original languages. His learning procured him a place in the college of Wittemburg. Tetzel, the vender of indulgences, came into his neighborhood, and declaimed in his usual style respecting their efficacy. The gross manner in which he

outraged all truth and decency, aroused the indignation of Luther. He opposed him. At first the views of the great German reformer on the manner of a sinner's justification before God seem not to have been very distinct. He clearly perceived, however, that it could never be obtained, through the indulgences which were vending by the priests. He commenced a minute examination of the scriptures, with a view to ascertain the doctrine which it taught relative to the atonement. This doctrine, indeed, was the pivot upon which the reformation turned. At every step new light burst upon his mind. His doctrines were eagerly embraced by thousands, who were delighted to find that any one had the boldness to call in question the dogmas of the bishop of Rome and his creatures. The effulgence shed upon the path of immortality attracted the gaze both of the common people and of princes. The elector of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, and many other German princes of distinction, embraced the truth as taught by Luther, and afforded him protection against the fury of the Roman pontiff, as well as against that of Charles V. emperor of Germany. Luther not only preached, but also published his opinions through the medium of the press. The truth which he enforced with the greatest earnestness, as the rallying point, in which the others concentred themselves, was, "that man is justified by faith alone without the deeds of the law." The extent of the atonement, he seems never to have examined with any great attention. Its truth, which had been obscured for many centuries, over a great part of those nations that called themselves christian, engaged so much of his powers of investigation and reasoning, that he had little time to devote to ascertain for whom precisely it was made. He maintained, however, most distinctly, that Christ was substituted in the room of sinners, and suffered the penalty of the broken covenant of works, which those who are saved would otherwise have suffered in their own persons; that his obedience to the precept of the law, and his suffering the penalty which it denounces, constitute that satisfaction which he offered to divine justice; and that there is no other way by which the sinner

can attain to a saving interest in this righteousness, than by receiving Christ Jesus by faith, which is therefore called saving or justifying faith. All these points are discussed with a perspicuity, and enforced by a soundness of argumentation, which may improve the most enlightened christian, even at the present time. His commentary on Paul's epistle to the Galatians, contains the substance of his views and reasonings on this all-important subject.

All the power of the German princes, who espoused the cause of the reformers, could not have saved them from destruction, had not the Head of the church caused the machinery of the nations to protect the friends of the atonement. He who on the cross, "bowed his head" and said of the atonement, it is finished, employed Solyman, the head of the Ottoman empire, Francis I. of France, and Henry VIII. of England, to engage the attention of Charles V. until the instruments whom he had raised up for the illustration of the truth, had brought their work to a state of perfection, which nothing could destroy. Hence, though while Luther was diffusing from both the pulpit and the press, those obnoxious doctrines, the emperor had not leisure to direct the force of the empire against him and his adherents to crush them. Correct habits of thinking, relative to the atonement, had become habitual to the mass of the people, throughout some of the most extensive circles of the empire. Luther had translated the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments into German, and they were read with eagerness by millions. A powerful body of learned and industrious, zealous and pious clergy, had organized themselves into a society, separate from the Romish church. They, with many princes, had bound themselves by a solemn covenant, to adhere to the truth at every hazard. A catechism, composed chiefly by Luther, was considered a standard of orthodoxy in the faith, in the Lutheran churches, as they began to be styled. It was employed as a manual for the instruction of children and youth, who now drink in the doctrine of the atonement, almost with their mother's milk. Salvation through the righteousness of Christ alone, is not

merely taught in this catechism, but forms the burden of it. The divinity of the person who wrought out this righteousness, his distinct personality as well as that of the Father who sent him to accomplish it, and of the Holy Spirit who applies it, after its accomplishment, are prominent articles in this exhibit of the faith of the Lutheran church.

The natural, total and universal, depravity of man, and his utter inability to help himself, until the Holy Spirit sprinkles upon him, for the restoration of his spiritual health, the blood of the atonement, are exhibited in this manual with great perspicuity. Whether the atonement was made for the whole human family, or for those only who shall participate savingly in its blessings, it does not state with precision. The following extract contains what is said on this point.

"*Q.* What has Christ fulfilled in our stead?

"*A.* Christ has perfectly fulfilled the whole law in our stead.

"*Q.* What has Christ taken upon himself?

"*A.* Christ has taken upon himself the guilt and punishment of our sins.

"*Q.* Whom has Christ redeemed?

"*A.* Christ has redeemed all men.

"*Q.* From what has Christ redeemed us?

"*A.* Christ has redeemed us from all sin, from death and from the power of the devil.

"*Q.* Will all men be saved?

"*A.* No. But few men will be saved.

"*Q.* Whose fault is it that so many men will be damned?

"*A.* Men themselves are to be blamed, that they are damned; because they will continue in sin.

"*Q.* Who will be saved?

"*A.* Those who receive Christ by faith shall be saved.

"*Q.* Canst thou of thine own power believe in Christ?

"*A.* No."

These questions and answers, the writer of this sketch has translated from the German of Luther's Catechism, used in all the Lutheran churches. It teaches with great perspicuity, the doctrine of substitution. Though the ex-

pressions respecting the extent of the atonement are equivocal, yet it is impossible to make the answers which we have quoted consistent with each other, on any other plan, than that of a definite satisfaction. What is the *nature* of the atonement here exhibited by the Lutheran church? It consists of redemption from all sin, from death, and from the power of the devil. Again, who are saved by this atonement? But a few only. Now, if Christ redeems all men, from all sin, from death and the devil, then all men, every individual human being, must be actually saved. As they assert that only a few are saved, by "all men" in the answer, can only be meant all men who believe, of all nations, conditions, and ranks. That such were the views of its writer, is ascertained from his other writings, or at least that he had no view opposed to this interpretation.

Though Luther and many of his German co-adjutors in the reformation, limited the atonement to those who are saved, yet it is not to be doubted, that a great majority of his followers, do interpret the word in the Catechism, to mean an absolute universality, and maintain that Christ actually made a full, a perfect atonement for every individual of the human race, while they at the same time, believe that millions will never obtain a saving interest in its blessings. This defect in the system of doctrines formed by Luther, and that branch of the church which takes its name from him, was of such importance, that the whole fabric from the middle of the 16th century to the present time has been gradually sinking into ruins. Those who turned aside from the truths of christianity, and have wandered into the paths of error and heresy, have generally begun their divergency at the point of definite atonement. One error in any system of principles may be compared to an opening in a mound for confining waters. The enclosed fluid is not only escaping every instant, but the breach generally widens, until finally the structure is undermined, and sinks into the flood.

What the reformers north of the Rhine left incomplete was soon supplied by an instrument raised up in the south,

and admirably suited by nature, education and grace for the work which he was destined to perform.

John Calvin was born at Noyon, in Picardy, a province of France, on the 21st of May, 1509. He was eleven years of age, when Luther burned the popish decretals, on a pile which he had erected for that purpose, before the college of Wittemburg. At a very early period he was initiated into the study of the Greek and Roman classics. He was destined for holy orders in the Roman Catholic church, to which his family adhered; and on the 21st of May, 1521, in the 12th year of his age, was presented with the living of de la Gesine. Believing him well calculated to shine at the bar, his father resolved that he should study the civil law, and for that purpose sent him to Paris, and placed him under the care of Peter de l'Etoile. From Paris he was transferred to Bourges to prosecute the same study, under Andreas Alceatus. The native energies of his mind, improved by education—his habits of observation and investigation, and the opportunities which he engaged of indulging them, in the various situations were he was placed, gave an early and uncommon expansion to his intellectual powers. He read the writings of the reformers, and embraced the doctrines which they taught, when he was but a youth. The boldness and firmness of his character did not permit him to remain a silent spectator of the contest which then raged with extraordinary violence and shook the christian world to its centre. He neither could nor would conceal his religious opinions. The persecutions which the reformers in France suffered under Francis I. compelled Calvin to leave the kingdom. He fixed upon Basil as the place of his residence. At that place he became acquainted with the two distinguished reformers Grynæus and Capito, who aided him in his enquiries after truth. He devoted his time, when residing at Basil, to the writing of his Institutions of the Christian Religion. All the powers of his mind were brought to bear upon this work, and all the treasures of his learning laid under contribution to enrich its pages. When engaged in its composition, he did not contemplate its publication; but the situation of

his brethren in France induced him to put it immediately to the press.

When Francis I. found the persecution of his protestant subjects gave great offence to the German princes who espoused the same opinions, and whose favour he courted, he published a proclamation, stating that those who suffered were only Anabaptists and other enthusiasts, who despised all government. Calvin determined upon the immediate publication of his Institutions, as a refutation to the royal calumny. He prefixed a dedication to Francis to the Institutions, in which with extraordinary eloquence he vindicates the cause of his persecuted brethren. The Institutions and deduction were written and published in both Latin and French. This work appeared in 1535, when Calvin was in his 26th year. The Institutions passed through many editions in a very short time. The demand for it, exceeded any thing in that way that had been known for many years. It was translated into Italian, German, Dutch and English, very soon after it made its appearance, and extensively circulated and read in all these languages. The dedication ran through an astonishing number of separate editions, which extended the fame of the author, and increased every where the demand for the Institutions.

The grand doctrine taught, illustrated and enforced in this book, is that of the atonement—the salvation of sinners through the righteousness of Christ Jesus, and "not by the deeds of the law." The scriptural representation of this subject, as contrasted with the erroneous views given of it by the church of Rome, is explained at large, and confirmed with great force of argumentation and various erudition. The extent of the atonement as made in the room of a definite number of sinners, given of the Father from eternity to Messiah—the plan of the universe as laid in eternity by the divine mind, and comprehending the great chain of cause and effect, are displayed with an energy and a grandeur of conception, to which even the enemies of the writer, and the opposers of his doctrine, have been compelled to bear testimony. The whole of the sacred volume, and the philo-

sophy of the universe, both of matter and mind, are laid under contribution to fortify his positions, and prostrate the errors and heresies of his adversaries. He has been charged with introducing novel opinions. The same doctrines, however, not to mention the apostle Paul, were, as all know, taught by Augustine, archbishop of Hippo. The perspicuity and closeness with which Calvin reasons on these subjects—the forcible manner in which he appeals "to the law and the testimony"—the consolatory exhibition which he gave of the Christian system, and the affectionate manner in which all is brought home to the practice and consciences of men, formed such a remarkable contrast with the gloomy superstitions and unintelligible jargon of the popish writers, that thousands of all ranks, and in all the southern kingdoms of Europe, embraced them with an avidity that had never before been witnessed from the days of the apostles. It was this immortal work that opened for him a career of usefulness and glory rarely equalled.

Soon after his Institutions were published, Calvin having heard that the dutchess of Ferarra was favourably disposed towards the doctrines of the reformation, paid her a visit, as some say, at her request, and was instrumental in introducing correct views of the plan of salvation into the northern regions of Italy. From Ferarra he travelled into France, where his stay was short. On his return to Basil he took the road that led through Geneva. The celebrated Farel was then pastor of the reformed church in that city, and professor of divinity in a reformed theological seminary which had been established some time before. He invited Calvin to unite with him in his labours. After many pressing solicitations, both from Farel and the people, he was induced to fix upon this as the place of his residence, and consented to participate in the labours of the theological school. Through his influence and instruction chiefly, in 1536, the year after his arrival, the people of Geneva entered into a solemn covenant with God and one another, to abjure the errors of popery, and to adhere firmly to the doctrines contained in a confession of faith which contained

the substance of the truths relative to the atonement, and the various other truths taught in Calvin's Institutions.

The reformation in doctrine, did not, at once, reform the lives of the Genevans. Farel, and Calvin, who had consented to unite with him in the pastoral charge of the congregation, refused to administer the sacrament to people of immoral character. In consequence of this measure, and their refusing to submit to an edict of the government of Berne, in relation to the sacrament of the supper, an act was passed ordering them to depart from Geneva, in 1538. Calvin retired to Strasburgh, where he was received with extraordinary marks of respect, and employed as a preacher and teacher of divinity.

The magistrates and people of Geneva soon became sensible of their error, and invited Calvin to return. At first he refused, but after many pressing solicitations returned, and in 1541, fixed on that place as his permanent residence. He now enlarged the plan of the theological seminary, and commenced a course of lectures on divinity, and on the philosophy of matter and mind.

The splendour of Calvin's talents, the extent of his erudition, and the power of his eloquence and the greatness of of his fame, soon attracted young men from every part of Europe to the Genevan school. Nearly all the youth who heard his lectures, embraced his views of the atonement, of the divine decrees, and of other cognate subjects. The eagerness with which they drunk in his instructions, and diffused the scriptural opinions which he taught, can be compared only to the reception with which the gospel met, as preached by the apostles and their immediate successors. The Presbyterian form of church government, which was adopted in Geneva and the protestant cantons of Switzerland, presented a model of simplicity, and formed a most striking contrast to the cumbersome machinery and oppression of the papal hierarchy. The disciples of the Genevan school embraced it, introduced it into other countries, and thus, in some sense, it became a vehicle, in which the doctrines of the atonement were conveyed to distant parts. So

true is this observation, that Presbyterianism in name, has scarcely ever been separated from Calvinism. These two, connected together, gave a new tone to the ecclesiastical and civil constitutions of the nations that compose the great family of European states. Even those who did not adopt them, were compelled to shape their course in a new direction. Some of the harsher features of the popish system of doctrine were softened, and their governments, both civil and ecclesiastical, were rendered more mild.

The substance of Calvin's Lectures, together with his Institutions, is comprehended in twelve volumes folio. The practical influence of the opinions which this wonderful man taught, were exhibited in the holiness of his life, and in the integrity of his moral deportment. He was most punctual in the performance of religious duty, and a laborious enquirer after knowledge, almost beyond the example of all former ages. He never would accept more than three hundred crowns per annum, as a compensation for his numerous and arduous labours. His enemies have never been able to fix upon him the slightest charge of immorality. Nearly the whole of the Roman Catholic and Episcopal churches, have directed against him their heaviest artillery, for more than two hundred and fifty years; yes, all the batteries of error and heresy have been opened upon him; and while they have been thus unwillingly bearing testimony to the greatness of his mind, they have not dared to charge him with any immoral conduct. Joseph Scaliger, who rarely praises any man, says, "Calvin was the greatest wit the world had ever seen from the days of the apostles." Guy Peter, a distinguished Roman Catholic, says, "At the age of twenty-two, he was the most learned man in Europe." The bishop of Valence, a popish clergyman, said of Calvin, that "he was the greatest divine in the world." Bayle, who took great delight in collecting together and exhibiting in dark colours, all that ever was said against the ministers of Jesus, especially the reformers, asserts that Calvin's enemies have never been able to fix a stain upon his moral character. When he speaks of Calvin's poverty, the means which he

had of acquiring wealth, and his dying worth no more than 300 crowns, he becomes quite enthusiastic, and challenges all antiquity to furnish an example of such noble self-denial, of such stern virtue and integrity; and declares that he eclipses all that has been said of Grecian and Roman virtue. Those who are best acquainted with Bayle's character, will know how to appreciate such praise, from such a man.

I have preferred giving these testimonies of Calvin's greatness and goodness, from his enemies, as they are evidently wrested from them by the stubbornness of well-known facts. The estimation in which he has been held by the Presbyterian churches on the continent of Europe, in Great Britain, and in the United States, is known to all who have the slightest acquaintance with the history of the church. Hence we are not to wonder, that he, in some measure, gave law to Europe, both during his life and after his death. The extraordinary reputation which he acquired, was procured almost solely by his labours on the doctrine of the atonement.*

* Many will contend that the burning of Servetus fixes a stain upon the moral character of this great instrument, raised up by the head of the church, to illustrate and defend the doctrine of the atonement. After the time which has been employed in the text, in developing his character, it would probably be thought an unpardonable omission, were this subject passed over in silence. Those who have been most clamorous against Calvin for this act, are the Socinians and the church of England. In such an affair, we should suppose the former have as little right to exclaim as any people in the world. We all know the dreadful persecutions which the orthodox suffered under the Arian emperors, and that even in modern times, their skirts are not clean. The church of England have only to look back to the house of Stuart, under whom, through the influence of Episcopal bishops, hundreds of Presbyterian dissenters were put to death in the most cruel manner, for adhering to their religious creed. Never did the cruelties of the Roman pontiffs exceed those which the Calvinists suffered from that house. Such accusations against Calvin, come from them with peculiar infelicity. It is, however, well known, that the burning of Servetus was the act of the senate of Geneva; a body as respectable both for talents and integrity, as any in Europe of its extent. That senate thought that the most monstrous blasphemies against the divinity of Messiah, and almost every other cardinal doctrine of the Christian system, merited civil pains. Did the house of Stuart think itself justifiable, did the bishops of the English church think themselves justi-

In 1559 Theodore Beza became the colleague of Calvin, in the Genevan school. This excellent man was born at Vezelai, in Burgundy, June 24th, 1519, the year after the reformation was commenced by Luther at Wirtemburgh. His infancy was spent in Paris, under the care of his uncle Nicholas Beza, who gave the direction of his studies to the celebrated Melchiar Wolmar, by whom he was educated in the protestant religion, from the year 1528 to 1535. He was designed by his friends for the profession of the civil law, which he studied in the university of Orleans, where he was entered at the age of seventeen, after having acquired a knowledge of the ancient classics, and the other branches of literature taught in the schools of France at that time. He continued in the university for three years, and was admitted to the practice of the law at the age of twenty. In youth he seems to have had little of the power of religion, though well instructed in its doctrines.

He arrived at Geneva in 1548, where he first became acquainted with Calvin, and probably with John Knox. The

fiable in putting to death the dissenters, for declaiming against an earthly government, because of its departure from the truths which it was solemnly sworn to support; and shall the same people, without renouncing what was then done, condemn the senate of Geneva, and denounce Calvin their friend and pastor, for putting to death a man who attacked the king of kings? It was a maxim universal among Christians at that time, that as God once gave commandment to punish gross blasphemers, and as they could not discover that he had ever repealed the law, it was still in force, and magistrates were bound to execute it, at their peril. The senate thought, and thought correctly, that the opinions of Servetus, boldly avowed and publicly taught, were grossly infamous, grossly blasphemous. If Jesus Christ is God, he who opposes this truth, and endeavours to propagate his opinions, is as guilty as he who would contend that God the eternal father, is a mere man. Those who declaim most against Calvin, believe that Christ is God. Will they maintain that rebellion against Jehovah is less criminal than rebellion against an earthly monarch?

The only ground upon which Calvin is charged with any degree of probability, of having had an active hand in the death of this arch heretic, is that one of the principal witnesses was a servant in his family. It is not denied that Calvin, and most of his friends, thought Servetus deserved punishment, and were willing to aid in furnishing testimony on the trial. But Calvin was not pleased with the severity of the sentence pronounced by the civil tribunal, and wished a milder form of death.

year following he was made professor of the Greek language, in the college of Lausanne, which station he filled with great reputation for nine years. Here his mind was particularly directed to the study of the Christian religion. He published several works while in this professorship, and among others, one entituled "De eterna Dei Presdestinatione," on the eternal decrees of God, in which he exhibited a lucid view of the doctrine of election and definite atonement, embracing the same views of that subject which is contained in the Institutions of Calvin. A reply to this work was written and published by Castalio. Beza answered him. These and various other theological works, procured for him great celebrity.

The accession of such a man to the school of Calvin was highly auspicious. He was in the vigour of life, while Calvin was on the decline. His piety was ardent, his zeal for the cause of the reformation inextinguishable, and his reputation little inferior to that of Calvin. Numerous Arminian and Popish writers assailed him with as much fury as they had done Calvin; but the opposition which the Genevan professors and school experienced, could not retard its progress, or check its growing character. No school in Europe possessed so much learning, or talents, or piety. Youth of every kingdom in Europe, were ambitious to have it said that they had heard the lectures of Calvin and Beza. Few left Geneva without embracing the doctrines relative to the atonement, which they taught; and hence they were the prevalent opinions in nearly all the reformed churches.

Beza was a profound politician as well as a great divine. Many princes sent for him to give them counsel in difficult cases. When the protestant cause was to be defended before kings, Beza was the champion. He was invited to attend a conference at Paissi, by the young king of Navarre, afterwards Henry IV. Here he triumphantly defended the protestant cause, in the presence of the first of the French nobility, and against the ablest advocates of popery which France could furnish. Catherine de Medicis was so charmed with his learning, eloquence and manners, that she de-

tained him for a considerable time in France. During the civil war which raged at that time, he was in the family of the prince of Condé. After Condé was taken prisoner at the battle of Dreux, he lived with admiral Coligni. By these means he had an opportunity of diffusing extensively among the French nobility, correct views of the doctrine of the atonement, and the nature of Messiah's mediatorial character. The effects of his stay in France were lasting, and highly important. He returned to Geneva in 1563, where his divinity school flourished, not only during his life, but for more than one hundred years after his death, which happened in the year 1600, when he was eighty-one years of age.

While Beza lectured at Geneva, John Arminius, of the United Provinces, attended the theological class. Arminius was born at Audwater, in Holland, in 1560. He received his education at the college of Marburg, where he was entered at the age of fifteen. At that time, his native country was sacked by the Spaniards, and nearly all his family put to the sword. He lost his father, when very young. From Marburgh he went to Geneva. Bayle, in his Biographical Dictionary, says, that, while at Geneva, Arminius offended some members of the academy, by embracing and teaching the philosophy of Ramus, in consequence of which, he was compelled to leave the school, and that he retired to Basil. Peter Paræus, as quoted by Bayle, says, that "he discovered in him, too great a disposition to refine upon things—that Beza advised one of his (Arminius') friends to check the subtilty of his genius, as a thing which Satan had made use of in several instances, to exclude great persons." The opinion which Beza formed of Arminius, was chiefly from a lecture that he read in the academy, where he was permitted to deliver a course, during the holy-days. He took himself an opportunity to advise Arminius, in relation to this character of his mind. "Do not engage yourself in vain subtilties," said he, "and if sometimes certain new thoughts arise in your mind, approve them not, without having first sounded them to the bottom, how pleasing soever they may appear at first sight. Calvin gave me this counsel, and I have

found great benefit in it." This advice ought to be most deeply impressed on the mind of every student of theology. James Grynæus tells us, that he discovered the same trait in the character of Arminius, while at Basil. It would have been happy for the church, had he followed the advice which Beza gave him. He is the author of those opinions, which from his name have been called Arminianism—opinions which have been embraced by millions, and which still continue to disturb the repose of the church.

Before his return to the United Provinces he travelled through Italy, and it is said, that at his return he found the affections of his friends much cooled towards him. Martin Lydius, professor of theology at Leyden, requested him to write an answer to a book which had appeared against Beza on Predestination. While employed in this work, the subtile speculations of the opponent, being well adapted to please such a mind as his, induced him to go over to the other side of the question, and he came out with an elaborate performance against Beza. He ransacked all the archives of the Pelagian heresy, and filled his book with the substance of their contents. In doing this he took the popular side. He taught that God had not decreed whatsoever comes to pass, but left every thing to the freedom of the human will, which he said possessed full power to choose either good or evil—that in order to the former, there is no need of any special aid from the Spirit of God, and that by the common operations of the Holy Spirit, all men have power given them to believe, repent, and perform all other good works. He also taught that Christ Jesus was not appointed a Mediator and Redeemer for a particular number of the human family; and that he died for all men indiscriminately. All these doctrines flatter the pride of human nature, and give men grounds for boasting before God. Hence many pious people, (and Arminius himself was probably one,) together with the whole multitude of the irreligious world, both carnal professors and those who make no profession, have embraced these errors. All, indeed, since the fall, are by nature Arminians. Hence his errors, enforced by many

plausible arguments, and great subtilty of reasoning, spread extensively. Many even in Holland espoused them. They were too, more favourable to the Roman Catholic church, than the doctrines of the Genevan school. The great body of the popish clergy had long held doctrines, not substantially different from those of Arminius. Those who embraced them among the protestants, rendered themselves less obnoxious to the potentates of Europe, who were nearly all Romanists, and consequently of the Arminian creed. The whole protestant church in the United Provinces was soon thrown into a state of agitation. The doctrines of the reformation had taken deep root there. The protestants had a powerful body of learned and truly orthodox clergy. Their theological seminary in Leyden, was in a highly respectable state, and had embraced fully the creed of the Genevan school. The state government was protestant. The nature of civil liberty, and the rights of men were better understood in Geneva, in the Swiss cantons, and Holland, than in any other countries in Europe at that time. And in these states the great truths of christianity, radiating from the doctrine of the atonement as from a common centre, were also more clearly understood than in any other part of the world. In countries where the christian religion is professed, these two generally go hand in hand. Banish the doctrine of the atonement with the truths which flow from it, and you pave the way either for anarchy or despotism. The whole of the civil rights of men, indeed, are no more than branches of the system of grace, which God has revealed to man. Hence when violent controversies on points of faith are agitated, civil commotions are generally excited. It was so in Holland.

In order to quell these religious disturbances, the head of the government resolved to convene a synod of delegates, from the churches in the provinces, and to invite the attendance of representatives from all the protestant countries in Europe. This synod met at Dort, Nov. 18, 1616. It was composed of the most learned and distinguished divines of Holland, both of the Arminian and Genevan school.

There were present delegates from Great Britain, Landaven, Davenant, Vardus, Goadh and Balcanquall; from the Low Countries; from Hesse; from the Palatinate; from Switzerland; from Genoa; and from the French Belgic provinces. Delegates were appointed by the reformed church in France, but they were prevented from attending, by the interference of the government. There never was a more learned, or enlightened body of divines assembled, nor on a more important occasion. The wisdom, of nearly all protestant Europe, was collected together, to express its views relative to the doctrine of the atonement, the divine decrees, the condition and moral powers of fallen men. After much preliminary discussion, as to the forms of procedure, it was resolved that the parties should be heard at length. The argument was protracted and luminous. After the Arminians and the orthodox divines had been heard at great length, the delegates from other churches, as well as those from the ecclesiastical bodies of the several provinces, were ordered to lay before the synod their opinions in writing, on the points in controversy.

We present an abstract of some of their views.

The following taken from the proceedings of this famous synod, is the opinion of the British divines:

" By the special love and intention of both God the Father and of Christ, Messiah laid down his life for the elect, that he might procure for them eternal life, and infallibly confer it upon them. Christ is the Saviour of one body, even of the church, Eph. 5. 21. therefore, he not only has procured salvation for his church, but he actually puts them in possession of it. He is the mediator of the new covenant, of which mention is made, Jer. 31. 31. which he has ratified by his death. The blessings promised in this covenant, are pardon of sin and sanctification, through the Spirit, which are really the application of that salvation which he hath procured. All those for whom Jesus died, shall experience the efficacy of his death, for the mortification of sin; and they 'shall become kings and priests unto God.' "

To the same effect is the statement exhibited by the delegates from Transylvania.

"The absolute will and purpose of God the Father, in delivering up his Son to death, and of his Son in enduring it, was that reconciliation with God, and eternal life, might be procured for all those who were, from eternity, elected to eternal life, and for those alone. According to this unalterable purpose of the Father and the Son, Christ the Mediator has procured remission of sin, reconciliation with God and everlasting life, for the elect alone, who shall be saved by his death on the cross; and this procurement of salvation and its application are of the same extent."

The deputies from the synod of Belgic Gaul, give their suffrage to the same doctrines in the following words:

"The price of redemption, which Christ paid to his Father, is of such dignity and value, that it would have been sufficient to have redeemed the whole human race, had it been destined by the Father for that purpose; but agreeably to the Scriptures, he died for those only who actually believe. Such was the will of the Father in sending his Son, and of the Son in dying."

"The death, resurrection and intercession of Christ, as well as the blessings which flow from such a reconciliation, justification, pardon of sin, sanctification and life eternal, are indissolubly connected together. They ought not to be, they cannot be separated. Christ was made a propitiation for sin, not without faith, but through faith; nor is there any effect represented in the Scriptures as flowing from it, but to those who believe in Christ and have communion with him."

The divines from the Palatinate express themselves as follows:—

"God the Father set apart Christ to redeem and make reconciliation for our sins, by the same love, through which he destined the elect to everlasting life. Christ died, rose again, and he intercedes in Heaven for elect believers, both in their stead and for their good."

The delegates from Hesse give their opinion as follows:

"The second proposition" (of the Arminians) "which asserts that Christ, by his death on the cross, merited reconciliation and pardon of sin, may be admitted if understood

in a qualified sense. If it be understood to mean that so great is the value and dignity of his atonement, that through it all might be saved, would they believe, we would assent to it; for sometimes orthodox divines have used the phrase in that sense. But if they mean that he procured actual remission of sin, and restoration to the divine favour, for those who shall eternally perish, the propositions ought to be rejected as erroneous. It can by no means be asserted with truth, that Christ procured the actual remission, of sin and reconciliation, so that by his death all men are reconciled to God, are redeemed and have a right to pardon of sin and eternal life. All the blessings which he procured, were for his sheep, that is for the elect, whom the Father gave to him, to save with an everlasting salvation; to them and not to others do the blessings of his purchase belong."

The Swiss divines say:—that Christ according to the eternal purpose and good pleasure of the Father, procured by his death and obedience, remission of sin, reconciliation with God, restoration to the divine favour, justification before God, salvation or eternal glory, for all the elect and for the elect alone, and of the whole world, since he obtained it for believers, both under the Old and New Testament, so that he will apply it to those very believers for whom he hath procured it. We deny, say they, that according to the eternal purpose of the Father, or his own, Christ Jesus, hath procured salvation indiscriminately for all men as fallen sinners—We deny that the death of Christ and its fruits can be separated, so that his death was in the room of more than those who are embraced in his resurrection, and intercession. We have learned from the Holy Scriptures, that he was raised for the justification of those for whose offences he was delivered, that he opens for them a way into the heavenly sanctuary, and that "he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

The divines from the Seven United Provinces, from the Netherlands, from Nassau, and from Geneva, all exhibit substantially the same view of these important subjects. We should be astonished that all the reformed divines, from

countries so widely separated from each other, speaking different languages, and raised under different forms of government, of different manners, should so admirably harmonize, were it not that they all drew their doctrines from the same fountain of divine truth.

These views were exhibited to the synod; in relation to a paper presented by the disciples of Arminius, in which they assert that Christ died for all men indiscriminately, that that there were none eternally elected to everlasting life, by an unchangeable decree, that Christ died for all, without any definitive object. There never has been so general an expression of the opinions of the protestant churches on the doctrine of the atonement since the commencement of the reformation. The ultimate decision of the synod, was substantially the same with that delivered by the delegates from the various protestant churches which were there represented. The Arminian doctrines were condemned as erroneous. They drew up a remonstrance against this decision. Hence they were called Remonstrants, and after the close of the synod, became exceedingly clamorous, complaining that they had been treated unfairly in not being permitted to exhibit an ample view of the ground which they occupied. The doctrines of Arminius had taken deep root, they were too well adapted to flatter human depravity, and to the opinions of the catholic church, to be eradicated by the decisions of the synod of Dort. If we are to credit the historians of that time, they spread more rapidly after the synod than they had done before. Nearly all the protestant churches were more or less affected by them. They found their way into France, and in the end produced the most deplorable consequences. We now invite the reader's attention to France.

Very soon after the commencement of the reformation in Germany, the eyes of a few people in that kingdom were opened to the truth. The Old and New Testaments were translated from the original Greek and Hebrew, into the French language by Oliveton, Calvin's uncle. So great was his assiduity that he completed the work in one year from its

commencement. Vatablus, regius professor of Hebrew, had prevailed upon Clement Marot to translate fifty of the psalms of David. The remainder were translated by Theodore Beza. The use of the psalms in divine worship, instead of the light trash composed by mere men, which had before been chaunted by popish worshippers, must have had a happy effect in opening the eyes of many to the true way of salvation. The effects of translating the Scriptures into the vernacular languages of Europe, were always, to teach many to abandon every reliance upon the absolution of the priests, the penances and remonstrances of the Church of Rome, to which they had formerly resorted for quieting their conscience, and to fly to the atoning sacrifice of Christ Jesus for the pardon of their sins.

Previously to the establishment of the Genevan school, little more progress had been made by the reformation in France, than what was just sufficient to provoke persecution, by which, as we have before stated, Calvin was compelled to fly from his native country. In no country on the continent, except Holland and the Swiss Cantons, did the Genevan school produce a more powerful effect, than in France. This might be partly owing to its contiguity, and partly to the circumstance that both Calvin and Beza were natives of France and received their education there. There were their friends, and the greater number of their correspondents. Their theological works were immediately translated into French, and circulated extensively through the kingdom. Their lectures were carried into France, became generally known, and the doctrines which they taught were embraced by thousands of all ranks. The youth, who among the reformers, consecrated themselves to the gospel ministry, were ambitious to hear the lectures of the Genevan professors, and profit by their instructions.

Ten years after the arrival of Beza at Geneva, the first general synod of the reformed church was held at Paris, and was a large, learned, and pious body, zealously attached to the cause of reformation. At this synod a Confession of Faith for the Gallic reformed church was presented and ex-

amined. It consisted of forty articles, which are well arranged, and generally exhibit correct and lucid views of the christian system.

In the fifth article they adopt unequivocally the Athanasian creed, give their own views to the same effect of the doctrine of the trinity, and condemn the heresies against which Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril, and Ambrose wrote. In the eighth article they say:—"We deny that God is the author of sin, or that the blame of things done amiss, can be laid upon him." The ninth article treats of the depravity of human nature, concerning which we have these words:—"His," man's, "nature has become altogether defiled, and being blind in his understanding, and corrupt in his heart, he hath utterly lost the integrity in which he was created." In article tenth, they speak to the same effect. "We believe," say they, "that all the offspring of Adam are affected with the contagion of original sin:" and in the next article they go on to say, "we believe that this stain of original sin is sin indeed; for it hath that mischievous power in it, to condemn all mankind, even infants that are unborn." The twelfth article treats of the delivery which God has provided, to rescue his people from this evil. "We believe," they say, "that out of this general corruption and condemnation, into which all men are plunged, God doth deliver them whom he hath in his eternal and unchangeable counsel chosen of his mere goodness and mercy, through our Lord Jesus Christ, without any consideration of their good works, leaving the rest in their sins and damnable estate." The following article speaks of the person, who wrought out this salvation, in the following words:—"We believe Jesus Christ, being the wisdom and eternal Son of God the Father, took upon him our nature, so that he is in one person, God and man."

The confession, which contains these views of the original depravity of human nature, rendering an atonement necessary, of the atonement itself, and of the person who made it, was written by John Calvin, and published by order of the reformed church in France, in 1556; but its solemn and final

ratification did not take place until the year 1571, at Rochelle, where a general synod was held that year. Beza presided in this synod, which was truly a venerable and illustrious body, and honoured with the presence of many persons of great distinction. At this ratification it was made a term of communion, by unanimous consent and with the full approbation of the protestant princes of the kingdom. It had been before its adoption, shown to Francis II. and to Louis IX. The act of ratification was signed by Jane, queen of Navarre, Henry, princé of Berne, Henry de Bourbon, prince of Condé, Louis, count of Nassau, and Sir Gasper de Colligne, high admiral of France. Thus ratified it was ordered that it should be read at the opening of every general synod, by which excellent regulation it was hoped that the ministers, who attended those synods, would have the system of doctrine continually before them in all their proceedings. The condition of the reformed church at that period, was in a high degree flourishing, and its increase had been surprisingly rapid. There were two thousand one hundred and fifty organized congregations, in many of which there were no less than six ministers, constantly employed in the performance of parochial duties, as was the case in that of Orleans, which had seven thousand communicants. Such was their number, their power, their wealth, their activity, and so many princes and princesses of high rank were there, who espoused the cause of the reformers, that the government though popish, of a high tone and absolutely despotic, was compelled to respect them.

Henry, prince of Navarre, was a protestant, and his influence and powers were at first, all exerted to promote the views of the reformers. He attended at the synods, and gave them his countenance. Upon the death of the king, he by the laws of hereditary succession had a right to the crown, but by the constitution of the empire, it was impossible for him; or, more correctly, because the great majority of the nobility and great families were Roman catholics, it was impossible for him to ascend the throne, unless he professed the Roman catholic religion, on which condition the

crown was offered him. He was not so devout and firm a protestant as not to be tempted by the offer of a kingdom. The duke of Sully advised him to comply with the terms offered; he followed the advice, renounced the protestant religion, made a profession of the popish, and was elevated to the throne. This event took place in 1588, seventeen years after Henry attended the synod of Rochelle. Sully his prime minister, who like his master, was a mere nominal professor, still continued attached to the protestant church, and was an instrument in the hand of the great Redeemer, of promoting its interests. In 1598, an edict was issued from Nantz, in Lower Languedoc, by Henry IV. securing to the protestant church in France the free exercise of their religion, and allowing them to occupy many important stations under the crown—an edict which for about one hundred years was a shield to the friends of truth, against the catholic and bigoted successors of that great prince. Such was the power and weight of the protestants, that, during the reign of Henry, who was their friend as far as consisted with his own ambitious views, and during the reign of his immediate successors, the crown would not have been able to crush them, even had the attempt been made.

From the bosom of the church itself proceeded its own ruin. The elevation of Henry to the throne of France, and the worldly spirit of the duke of Sully, opening the way for a union of distinguished protestants with catholics in the administration of the public affairs of the nation, a disposition to flatter and accommodate the king, for the favours which he bestowed upon them, and the profound policy of catholic statesmen, soon caused a relaxation among the friends of truth, of which the first evidence recorded in history, was given about the year 1595. A plan had been formed to unite the popish and protestant churches. It originated with four protestant ministers, Rotan, Marlas, Secres, and Cayer, of whom the two latter became Roman catholics. Rotan was appointed to appear before the king in a dispute against the leading doctrines of the catholics, and to betray the cause of the reformers; but he did not attend, and Be-

raud of Mantauben, appeared in his place, and in a most triumphant manner, vindicated the protestant opinions in relation to the inefficacy of all other means of salvation than the atoning sacrifice of Christ Jesus. But the zeal of the reformers was cooling, and error was creeping abroad among their churches, and finding its way into their theological schools.

A minister of very considerable talents and professor at Herborne, Piscator, was cited to appear before the general synod of Gap, in 1603, and answer to charges brought against him in relation to some errors which he had written and taught on the atonement, such as, "that the active obedience of Christ Jesus, or his obedience to the precepts of the divine law, forms no part of the sinner's justifying righteousness before God; that the sufferings of Christ in his life and at his death were all that he did in the room of the sinner; that on account of these sufferings our sins are pardoned; but it must be on the footing of our own personal holiness that we gain admission to Heaven." The synod denounced those errors as of a dangerous nature and of alarming magnitude, and instructed the subordinate synods to depose all their members who should embrace and obstinately maintain them; and provided Piscator would not publicly renounce them they appointed two of their members, Sohnis and Ferrier, to write an answer to them. They also wrote to the universities of England, Scotland, Leyden, Heidelburg, Bazil, and Herborne, to unite with them in the condemnation of these errors. Regnault, pastor of the church at Bordeaux, was appointed to report the decrees of the synod to Piscator. Sohnis addressed himself to the task assigned him by the synod, and completed his answer to the Piscatorian errors before the meeting of the general synod of Rochelle in 1607.

In this synod, the subject was again discussed, and some errors in relation to repentance, which Piscator was said to have taught. The professor sent letters to the synod, written in a very gentle and conciliatory style, containing explanations, palliations and vindications of the doctrines which he

had embraced and taught. On the subject of repentance, the synod express their approbation of the explanations which he had given, and reiterate their disapprobation of his views, respecting the active obedience of Christ. Their tone, however, is lowered in a very remarkable manner. Felix Huguet, a minister of the gospel in Dauphiny, had written and published in Geneva an answer to Piscator's writings, in which he acted contrary to a standing decree of the general synod—that no minister should publish a book, without the consent of the consistory or presbytery to which he belonged, a license which Huguet had not obtained from the consistory of Dauphiny. The synod declare that "he incurred a grievous censure," and say, with great emphasis, that the book of Piscator against which Huguet wrote, had not been published, and applaud the conduct of the magistrates of Geneva, in endeavoring to suppress his book. They also express high approbation of the style of Piscator's letters, in explanation of his views. Sohnis presented to the synod his reply, which was approved as orthodox, but he was not allowed to publish it, "least," as they say, "the peace of the church should be disturbed." In all these proceedings, we discover, that during the four years, which had elapsed since the meeting of the synod of Gap, the tone of the orthodox in the Gallic church, had suffered a most inauspicious relaxation. What was the cause? We have hinted at it before. The duke of Sully, the duke de Bouillon, the king's sister, and many other illustrious personages of the protestant faith, formed a part of Henry's court, where the catholic religion prevailed; and their attachment to the unbending course which was held by Calvin, Beza, and their immediate successors, was greatly weakened. Accommodation was becoming the fashion of the times, the warmth of opposition to the catholic errors had greatly cooled, and this coolness began to manifest itself in all the acts of discipline, which related to the errors that were making inroads upon the church. The protestant nobility had political projects, for the attainment of which, the preservation of harmony and the appearance

of strength must be preserved, though at the expense of truth. To these views, the protestant ministers, as they have too often done in other instances, permitted themselves to become subservient. The very great favour shown to Piscator on this occasion, was owing, at least in part, to the interference of the earl of Nassau, who wrote warmly in his favour to Regnault. The synod was presented with the Earl's letters, in which he promises to prevent Piscator's notions from spreading, "provided he receive no provocation from any public writings." This was intended to prevent the book written by Sohnis, from appearing before the world, with the sanction of the synod, and it had the desired effect. A vote of thanks to the Earl was passed, "for his pious intentions," and a promise made that no provocation should be given. Thus the cause of truth was betrayed, as an apology for which, they caused that Confession of Faith, which they were trampling underfoot, to be read over, and it was unanimously approved and sworn to by the deputies. That the spirit which prevailed in this synod has not been misunderstood appears from their proceedings in relation to an intimation given by the king, that the publication of that article in the confession, in which the pope is called Antichrist, would be highly offensive to him. The synod pusillanimously decreed, in a conditional manner, that the obnoxious article should not be printed, and that his majesty should be humbly intreated to prevent any one from being injured for what had been done in relation to this affair. Thus we see the protestant church in France rapidly sinking into a state of general debility. Still it contained a great body of learned, illustrious, pious and faithful divines, among whom may be named as the most distinguished Peter de Moulin, better known by the name of Molinæus. This great and good man saw, in its full extent, the evil which threatened the church, and employed his utmost efforts to avert it. He undertook to answer the errors which were spreading from the University of Herborne, in which work he employed four years. It was written in Latin, and the manuscripts were laid before the synod of Privas, which appointed a com-

mittee to examine them, and they were pronounced orthodox, and their author thanked for his labours in defence of the truth; but, least the repose of the church should be disturbed, he was prohibited from publishing them.

At the synod of Vitré, 1617, Sohnis was permitted to publish the manuscripts, which ten years before he had presented to the synod of Rochelle: but the evil had then become too extensive, and too deeply rooted, to be affected by the publication. About this time measures were put in train by the prince of Orange, for calling the synod of Dort; and letters were sent to the reformed church in France, inviting the attendance of commissioners, who were appointed. The deputies were Chamier, Du Moulin, and Chave, among the most distinguished French divines. They had commenced their journey to Holland, but were recalled by an arrêt of Louis XIII, the son of Henry IV. Thus we discover how unsatisfactory the Calvinistic views of election, definite atonement, &c. are to the Roman catholics, and that the Arminian system was, at that time, considered by them in a friendly light, and as deserving protection.

Notwithstanding the coldness, which was creeping into the reformed church in France, the great body of their divines, and of their people, were orthodox in their principles; and they were still willing to hazard something with the government in expressing their opinions. This was done at the synod of Alez, the first general synod that met in France after the synod of Dort. It was assembled in 1620, and not only expressed its entire approbation of the decrees of that body of illustrious divines, but adopted them in the most unequivocal manner; and every member bound himself by solemn oath, to support them to the utmost of his power. The expression of a belief in them was made a term of ecclesiastical communion, and the candidates for the ministry, the principals and professors of the universities and theological schools, and all the elders of the church, were ordered to express on oath their approbation of them, and their resolution to support and maintain them to the end of their lives. The civil magistrates of the Netherlands are

highly applauded for their vigilance, and their efforts to prevent or banish what the synod denominates, "heresies in the articles of predestination and its dependencies." It does not appear that, in the adoption of these measures, there was one dissenting voice, either in the synod or in the reformed church in France. The first person who subscribed the oath was the celebrated Du Moulin.

All these measures, however, were not sufficient to guard the Church, against inroads from the Arminian errors, which like noxious effluvia spread their sickening influence over all the Reformed Churches in Europe. The whole of the Lutheran Church was soon tainted, and the Gallic was not exempt. Mr. John Cameron, Bishop of Norwich, originally a Scottish clergyman, had been settled, before the synod of Alez, in a congregation at Bourdeaux, and thence transfered to the divinity professorship at Saumur. Cameron was an eloquent and popular man, who had a talent of recommending himself to those with whom he became acquainted. At this synod a petition was presented from his former charge at Bourdeaux, requesting his restoration to them, and also one from the College of Saumur, for his continuance in the Theological chair. The latter was fortified by a recommendatory letter from lord du Plessis Marley, and prevailed, as the synod continued him one year longer in the professorship. This man was destined to be instrumental in preparing the way for destroying the interests of Reformation in France. He had embraced and taught in the divinity school, the opinion, that there are several kinds of election: that some men are elected to faith, who are not peremptorily elected to everlasting salvation; and also some views relative to the extent of the atonement, which were nearly related to those of Arminius. What these were will probably be ascertained with more precision, from the creed of the professor who succeeded him in the theological chair at Saumur. This was Moses Amyraut, who was born at Bourguil, a small town of Turaine, in September, 1596. He was destined for the practice of the law, which he read at Poitiers, prosecuting his studies with extraordinary assi-

duity. The reading of Calvin's Institutes, and the persuasions of his friends, especially of the pastor of the Reformed church at Saumur, induced him to relinquish the profession of the law, and engage in that of divinity. He entered himself as a student under Cameron. The semi-arminian views of his teacher he adopted, and entered into them with a zeal which in him was constitutional. He was settled in the pastoral charge of a congregation at St. Aignon, in 1626; but on the removal of the Rev. Dr. Daille, pastor of the reformed Church at Saumur, to Charenton, Mr. Amyraut was invited to take his charge at the former place, and accepted the invitation. In 1633 he was inaugurated into the professorship of theology, in the college, in which he was associated with two of the most distinguished scholars in France, Lewis Cappell, and Joshua de la Place. Amyraut was himself a man of great industry, and no ordinary share of learning; his manners were courtly in a high degree and his eloquence persuasive. Three such men were sufficient to give celebrity to any literary institution and to make it flourish. No school in France, under the direction of the reformed church, was at this time so powerful as the university of Saumur, and the character of the three professors now associated in it, increased greatly its reputation. In addition his learning, Amyraut had cultivated, successfully, the favour of the great, and soon extended his fame beyond that of all his predecessors. He espoused and taught, to the numerous youths who crouded his school, all the doctrines which he had imbibed from his master, and probably extended further his inroads upon the system of reformed truth. He taught boldly that Christ had died equally for all men, that from eternity God willed the salvation of the whole human race, under the condition of faith; but had, at the same time, decreed that he would bestow faith upon those only who should be saved. Thus we see, that within thirty-three years after the death of Arminius, one half at least of his errors are introduced among the reformers of France, under the most powerful patronage, and pressed with extraordinary eloquence and much learning, upon the youth

who were prosecuting their theological studies at this seminary. To embrace these doctrines and preach them, were comparatively easy. They were much less obnoxious to the Roman Catholic bishops, noblemen and princes, than those of the Genevan school, introduced into the French reformed confession of faith. That Cameron himself was swayed by these motives, to a certain extent, is highly probable, nay almost certain; and youth at all times, before they are fully confirmed in the way of truth and holiness, are too ready to adopt that system which will afford them an opportunity of accommodating the world, especially the great. The cardinals who were the prime ministers of the king of France, used every effort and every artifice, that ingenuity could devise, and their influence effect, to overawe and crush the protestants, or to allure them from their duty. The edict of Nantz, which was then esteemed sacred, tied up their hands from persecution; besides, it would have been a hazardous experiment to attack in this way, so powerful a body. In these circumstances, what course would such profound politicians as Richlieu and Mazarin be likely to adopt? Address themselves, certainly, to the heads of the protestant church, in the way of flattery and seduction; especially to the theological professors. This course precisely, we find them pursuing. They knew, as well as we know, that the doctrines of Arminius, which Cameron had embraced and taught at Saumur, were different from those taught by the early reformers and that they approximated to popery. They early discovered the talents, growing reputation, and influence of Amyraut and his associates, Cappell and La Place. They knew that this school must produce a powerful effect on the state and affairs of the protestant church in France, and that the cause of reformation must make rapid progress, when promoted by a combination of such learning and eloquence. To Amyraut, therefore, they determined to address themselves.

The year after his inauguration into the professorship, we find Amyraut dining with the archbishop of Chartres, a person high in the friendship and confidence of the minister, cardinal Richlieu, at whose suggestion the invitation is sup-

posed to have been given. A French catholic nobleman of elevated rank, was one of the party. After dinner the subject of religion was introduced, by the nobleman, who charged the protestants with teaching harsh things on the subject of predestination, and a slight controversy ensued. Amyraut was, no doubt, inclined to soften some of those features of the Calvinistic system, which were thought to be harsh, and said precisely such things as the cardinal, the bishop, and his noble friend anticipated. On the following day, as the professor returned to Saumur, he called by invitation, at the house of the nobleman, with whom he had dined at the bishop's; and afterwards said that "he found the noble personage well affected towards the protestant religion." He, however, ventured to express some doubts of Calvin's views relative to the divine decrees, the extent of the atonement, &c. These scruples Amyraut endeavoured to remove and promised to write a book, containing such views as he had exhibited on that day, and the preceding, with which the gentleman was much pleased. In the following year 1634, the book appeared,—a book which set the whole protestant Church of France on flame. A large body of the reformed clergy, especially those beyond the river Loire, considered the doctrines which he taught relative to conditional predestination, and indefinite atonement, as at war with the standard of the Gallic reformed Church, and of the doctrines of the Genevan school, all which they believed to be founded on the Holy Scriptures. A charge was brought against him, by Du Moulin, of violating the decrees of the synod of Dort, and those of the general synod of Alez, respecting them. No man stood higher among the ministers of the reformed Church than Du Moulin, and he adhered, as we have before seen, firmly, to the doctrines taught in their Confession of Faith. The synod, before which those charges were exhibited, met at Charenton in 1637. All the divines from the south of the Loire were instructed, by their respective presbyteries, to use their influence, to have the censures of the Church inflicted upon Amyraut; and many contended that if he would not abandon his errors, he should be

degraded from his ministerial office, and from the professor's chair. Bayle in his Biographical Dictionary, represents all this opposition, as proceeding from the influence of Du Moulin. But if the views of those divines were not the same with those of their confession of Faith, and of Calvin, why should the innovations of Amyraut have alarmed them? Were the assertion of Bayle true it would be highly honorable to that illustrious divine. No censure, however, was inflicted on the innovator. It was now more than seventeen years, since Cameron had begun to teach the doctrines of hypothetical decrees and general atonement, and four years since Amyraut from the same chair, had been employed in disseminating the same opinions among the students who were educating for the ministry at Saumur. Great numbers of the young clergy had embraced, and openly taught them, while doubtless, many who would not risk the teaching of them publicly, were secretly well disposed to them. Amyraut possessed very great popularity, and the ruling powers were friendly to him. On all these accounts, the interests of truth were compromitted. He was indeed enjoined by the synod not to disturb the repose of the church, with his novel opinions, and with this injunction he promised to comply—but his promise he did not fulfil. To preserve the peace of the church also, as they said, the opposers of the *hypothesis*, as Amyraut's view of the Christian system was called, were ordered not to write against him. A strange injunction truly, prohibiting the ministers of the church from defending the doctrines embodied in their standard, which they were all sworn to maintain!

At the synod of Charenton, which met 1645, Amyraut was charged with having violated the injunction of silence, as to the disputed points; to which he replied, that he received provocation from the attacks of his opponents, which he thought himself bound to repel. The synod passed an act of "holy amnesty" as they called it, by which all that had passed, was to be buried in oblivion, and both Amyraut and his antagonists were ordered not to touch in public

the disputed points. There was a privilege, however, granted to the professor, provided he could obtain the consent of the synod of Anjou, to answer those foreign divines who had written against his hypothesis. This was designed to give him an opportunity of replying to Rivetus, Des Marets, and Spanheim, divines of Holland, who had embarked in the controversy against him with a noble zeal, and with very great ability. The two former had been originally French divines, but owing to their attachment to the truth, and their boldness in defending it, they had fallen under the displeasure of the government, and had retired to the Low Countries. Spanheim was his principal antagonist, and the synod of Anjou gave Amyraut the privilege of replying to him. Thus by a strange kind of indecision and lenity, the controversy was permitted to rage in all its fury, while it was nominally prohibited. Amyraut, however, had greatly the advantage of his antagonists in point of effect. His answers to Spanheim and the other Holland divines, were published in the French language, extensively circulated and read, while the works of his opponents were written in a language unknown, except to the learned, they had comparatively few personal friends, and hence but few could, or would read their works. As to the affairs of the church in France, it amounted to nearly the same thing, as if they had given Amyraut full privilege to write and publish his opinions, while the friends of truth were prohibited from entering the lists with him. From all these considerations, however irresistible the reasonings of the Holland divines might be, they could produce but little effect in France, and their power in checking the torrent of error, which was overflowing the reformed church there, and undermining the foundations of the whole fabric, which had been erected with great labour, was almost nothing.

The chief work of Spanheim, in this controversy, was his Vidicæ Vindiciarum, which was edited by his son after his death, with a preface written by Rivetus. It probably contains the substance of all that was written against the Amyraldists, as the disciples of Amyraut have been called. It is

a work of great labour, and replete with solid argument and sound criticism. Both Amyraut and the Holland divines permitted a considerable degree of feeling and warmth of passion to enter into the controversy. It is evident that Spanheim, and the other orthodox divines who were his coadjutors, considered the best interests of the reformed church, and the beautiful harmony of the Christian system, put in jeopardy by the doctrines of the Salmurensian divines. Spanheim, in the posthumous work alluded to, reasons from a great variety of topics against the doctrine of hypothetical decrees, and general, indefinite atonement. He argues in favour of absolute election and definite atonement from the particularity of the first promise, made to our fallen ancestors in the garden of Eden; and the contrast between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent; and from its particular fulfilment in his posterity, as in the families of Noah, Abraham, and Israel; from the limited economy of the gospel under the Old Testament dispensation, as confined to the Jewish nation; from the nature of the sacrifices, as indicating a substitution, precisely in the room of sinners; from the divine justice demanding the acquittal of all those for whom the price of redemption was paid; from the mediatory character, as the representative and surety of his spiritual seed; from the situation of the millions of the human family who were actually suffering the effects of the wrath of God in the mansions of everlasting misery, at the very time when Messiah was offering up to his Father the atoning sacrifice, and hence could receive by it no benefit; and from the unchangeableness of the divine character, who cannot will that man shall be saved, and yet not bestow upon him that faith which is his own gift, and without which the sinner must inevitably perish. From all these and various topics of argumentation, with a very extensive and minute examination and collation of scripture texts, he reasons that God did not, that he could not, upon the scriptural plan, destine Christ to be the redeemer of any but those who shall be actually saved. He charges his adversary with giving false views of the character of God; with mis-

taking the nature of the Christian system; and with exhibiting false views of the nature of the gospel. He meets and overturns all the objections which, with great subtilty of reasoning, extensive and prodigious learning, had been collected by his antagonist. He certainly triumphs in the judgment of every impartial reader who attends with care to the controversy.

The Gallic synod, however, had opened the floodgates of error, and no efforts of a foreign individual could arrest the torrent, or retard its course. It spread over France with astonishing rapidity. The friends of orthodoxy, alarmed at the mischief which, too late, they perceived had been done, fled in dismay from the overwhelming deluge that poured in upon them. Those who embraced the hypothesis vainly fancied that they had found out a means to heal all the divisions which had rent the church from the commencement of the reformation. They thought that the Arminians, at least, could cordially unite with them; and they even extended their views to the Roman catholics. For this purpose, they courted the reigning catholic princes, who were lying in wait and plotting against them to their destruction. Amyraut preached with great vehemence the doctrine of passive obedience; the divine right of kings; and non-resistance; and was warmly supported by those who espoused the hypothesis. Thus, while the Amyraldists were breaking down the fair fabric of truth, which their fathers had erected, they were actively employed in giving their power to the beast, and endeavouring to support one of those thrones of iniquity with which God has declared that "he will have no fellowship."

Still, a majority of the ministers were sound in the faith. Their practical errors were a relaxation of discipline and a spirit of accommodation, which induced them to pass, without censure, those who from the pulpit and the press, violated the canons of their church and their own solemn oaths, sworn at their ordination to the ministry. Though in compliance with a mandate from the king, a general sy-

nod had blotted the name of the synod of Dort out of the oath imposed upon those who were entering on the ministry, and had permitted Amyraut and his coadjutors to escape without censure, yet they often expressed the most decided disapprobation of these novel tenets.

Under the head of errors rejected, we have this strong reprobation of their opinions. " Those who teach that God's election to eternal life, is of divers kinds, the one general and indefinite, the other definite and particular, and this again is incomplete and revocable, not peremptory but conditional, or else complete and unchangeable, peremptory, or absolute; item, that there is an election to faith, and another unto life and salvation, so that election unto justifying faith, may be without a peremptory election to salvation—these are nothing else but the inventions of brain sick men."

The general synod of Alençon received a letter from the church of Geneva, signed on behalf of the whole, by Tronchien, Diodate, Chabray, Prevost and Paulient. It warns them, in very strong terms, to beware of the errors, which had been introduced at Saumur, and advises the Gallic church, " to grub them up by the roots." This advice is enforced by a great variety of considerations, but chiefly from the situation in which the church was then placed. A work written by Rivetus on the same subject, and containing an elaborate refutation of the Salmurensian errors, was received, by the same synod, accompanied by very strong recommendations from many of the most distinguished Protestant divines of that age, among whom we find the names of Polyander, Wallæus, Thysius, Triglandius, Bogerman, Sertaurius, Majorinus, Altingius and Francis Gomar.

Du Moulin also wrote to this synod a very spirited, and eloquent letter, which reprobates in strong terms the policy of permitting these noxious subtilties to spread abroad in the church. Some have said that the doctrines in question, were the same in reality with those of Calvin and the Genevan school generally. Let us hear what Du Moulin, who had the very best opportunities of information on this subject, thought respecting it. In his letter to the synod of

Alençon, he says, "nor can any one deny but that one third part at least of Cameron's works, is spent in the confutation of Calvin, Beza, and the rest of our reforming doctors,—yet, notwithstanding these blemishes, I cannot find in him that doctrine which is now vented by those, who boast themselves to be his disciples and followers, and cover themselves with the shield of his authority. I cannot find where he saith that the distinct knowledge of Jesus Christ is not necessary to salvation, nor that he saith that Jesus Christ died equally, and alike for all men; nor doth he teach that the reprobates may be saved if they will, or that God hath counsels and decrees that may be frustrated, and shall never obtain their effect; nor farther, can I find where he saith that God hath taken away from (all) men their natural impotency to believe and convert themselves to him; nor that he reduceth the regenerating spirit to a mere suasion." Such is a summary of the Salmurensian errors, by a man who lived at the time when they were broached; and also the views which he had as to their opposition to the doctrines of the early reformers. Though such testimony is satisfactory, we do not need it while we can have access to their writings.

All these warnings, however, could not excite the judicatories to eradicate the errors by inflicting the censures of the church. Men were permitted to remain in the ministry in open violation of their most solemn oaths, and while they were tearing down the pillars of truth. They had also another admonition to arrest the progress of these errors—the general corruption of manners, which began to prevail about the time that the Salmurensian errors commenced their career. Even enemies admit that the most rigid Calvinists have been, generally, the most virtuous class of Christians. The times of the greatest orthodoxy, have always been marked by the greatest piety. What Bayle, though an enemy, is forced to say of the purity, and the stern integrity of Calvin's character, is generally true of his sincere disciples. While the doctrines of his school, in other words the doctrines of the Bible, prevailed in France, the re-

formed church there was distinguished for the talents, the zeal, the piety, and the faithfulness of the clergy, and for the devout lives of her members; but when the fountains of truth began to be poisoned, the floodgates of vice and immorality were also thrown open. We find the minutes of the general synods from that time, groaning under the complaints, sent up from the subordinate courts, that the churches were not well attended, that they were leaving off the custom of carrying their psalm books to places of public worship, that horse racing, gambling, intemperance, theatrical exhibitions and various other vices, were become common, to a most alarming degree. This was the voice of providence, and though they would not attend to the admonitions of other churches, nor to those of the aged and venerable among themselves, yet they should have listened to this. But they were deaf to all.

What reward did the protestants receive from the catholics, for all those concessions, made as they partly admitted for the sake of peace? Such a reward as men of the world, or devotees of idolatry and superstition always bestow upon those who forsake the truth. God, in his righteous judgment, gave up the church to divisions; it ceased to flourish, and became feeble and more contemptible in the eyes of the enemy every day; and the fathers of the church and friends of truth, gradually sunk into the grave. While Louis XIII. was making incroachments upon the rights of the reformers, Du Moulin wrote a letter to James I. of England, in which he insinuated that the friends of the reformation, in France, hoped for his aid. The letter fell into the hands of the duke of Buckingham, and was by him sent to the king of France, who immediately issued orders to apprehend the writer. He got notice of the storm that was gathering, and made his escape, before it burst upon him. He was taken under the protection of the duke de Bouillon, who procured his settlement as pastor of the congregation and principal of the university of Sedan, a small principality, belonging to that nobleman, where he died in 1656, admired and beloved by all the good, and leaving his praise

in all the churches. Soon after his death, the Salmurensian errors seem to have overrun almost the whole church, some of whose members embraced them in full, and nearly all in part. In 1669, thirty-six years after the commencement of Amyraut's professional labours, the number of protestants in France was diminished to one third of what it had formerly been, and these were disunited, exhibiting no more than the fragments of what had been a magnificent fabric. They were no longer an object of respect, to the crown, or to the catholic princes. In 1680 an act was passed, by which protestants were incapacitated for holding civil offices; in 1682, protestant gentlemen were prohibited from keeping servants of their own religion, in their families, and all protestant officers and princes of the nobility degraded; and in 1685, fifty-one years after the commencement of Amyraut's public career, the edict of Nantz, was finally and completely revoked, and the storm of persecution burst upon the church, in all its ruthless fury. As these were doubtless, the judgments of God upon a church, for a dereliction of truth and duty, it will be proper to give an extract from *Gallia Reformata*, a work edited by the Rev. Mr. Quick of London, from which the principal part of the facts we have given in relation to the Gallic church is taken. It contains a complete file of the minutes of the general synods of France, from that of Paris when the draught of their confession of faith was presented, to the revocation of the edict of Nantz. He gives * the following picture of their suffering. "They," the papists, "fell upon the protestants, and there was no wickedness though ever so horrid, that they did not put in practice, that they might enforce them to change their religion. Amidst a thousand hideous cries, they hung up men and women by the hair, upon the roofs of their chambers, or by hooks in the chimneys, and smoked them with wisps of wet hay, till they were no longer able to bear it; and when they had taken them down, if they would not sign an abjuration of their

* Vol. I. pp. 131, 132.

pretended heresies, they then put them up again. Some they threw into great fires kindled on purpose, and would not take them out until they were half roasted. They put ropes under the arms of some and plunged them often into deep wells, until they would promise to change their religion. They bound them as criminals are, when put to the rack, and in that posture put funnels into their mouths, and poured wine down their throats, till its fumes had deprived them of their reason, and they had in that condition made them consent to become Catholics, or until the doleful outcries of these poor tormented creatures, calling upon God for mercy, compelled them to let them go. They beat them with staves and dragged them, all bruised, to the Romish churches, where their enforced presence was reputed as an abjuration. They kept them waking for seven or eight days together, relieving one another by turns, that they might not get any rest or sleep. In case they began to nod, they threw water in their faces, or holding kettles over their heads, they beat on them, with such continual noise, that the poor wretches lost their senses.

"If they found any sick, who kept their beds, whether of fevers, or other diseases, they were so cruel, as to beat an alarm of drums about their beds, for whole weeks together, till they had promised to change."

All impartial historians of these times, speak in the same strain with Quick, of the sufferings of the French protestants, after the revocation of the edict of Nantz. Death with every species of cruel torture, or flight from the kingdom were the only alternatives left to those, who adhered to the confession of faith, and to the order of the protestant church. Many thousands fled as exiles, into remote countries, in which they ended their days. The greatest number of those exiles, took refuge in Holland. Among these was the divine Saurin, the learned Claude, and many other distinguished persons. It is remarkable, that nearly all of them were more or less tainted with the Salmurensian errors. Saurin whose name should never be mentioned without respect says, " there certainly is some sense in

which Christ died for all mankind." This however, seems to be the only point in which he departed from the opinions of the orthodox, for he maintained that the atonement was necessary—that God could not, in consistency with his justice, dispense with the punishment of sin. Either in his own person, or in that of his surety, the sinner must receive that punishment which he deserved. "If God," says he, "be free to relax any part of the punishment, denounced, he is equally free to relax the whole. If we may infer that he will certainly release the sufferer from a part, because he is at liberty to do so, we have an equal right to presume he will release him from the whole, and there would be no absurdity in affirming the one, after we had allowed the other."

If those, who fled from their country, were tinctured with those errors, what must have been the condition of those who made their peace with their persecutors, by sinful compliances? In reality the whole beautiful fabrick sunk into complete ruin, from which it hath never yet emerged. Little has since been heard of the reformed church in France. It has always, it is true, existed as a body, but entirely degenerated from the soundness of the faith and the purity of practice which characterized the reformers in the days of Calvin, Beza, and Du Moulin. It has been said, upon good authority, that the greater part of the synod of Rochelle, and of the French protestants generally, about three years ago denied the divinity of Christ Jesus, and considered him with Arius, either a super-angelic being, or with a modern heretic, a mere man. The point at which they began to deviate from the system of truth, was that of a definite atonement; and they have gone from one step to another, until they now deny the divinity of Messiah, and have thus torn away, as far as in them lies, the last pillar of the Christian church, and rendered it heathen except in name.

While correct views of the doctrines of grace, especially of the nature of the atonement were spreading from the Genevan school, a heresy of a most formidable nature arose in the north of Europe. We have before seen that the Arian heresy overspread a great portion of the Christian

church, and swept away all belief in the doctrine of the satisfaction by Christ Jesus. Still, the Arians never thought of maintaining that Jesus was any thing less than the most exalted of all created intelligences. The Arians considered Christ as in some sense the saviour of men. It was reserved for modern times to attempt to degrade "God with us," to the character of a mere man. This heresy was broached by Lælius Socinus, in the sixteenth century. In 1547, he was forced to fly from Sienna in Tuscany, on account of some opposition to the Roman Catholic religion. He settled in Switzerland, after having travelled over a great part of Europe, and embraced the Helvetic confession of faith, by a public profession. This confession exhibits on the person Christ Jesus, his mediatorial character, the doctrine of the trinity, the decrees, the atonement, and all other capital doctrines of the Christian system, the same views with those taught in the Genevan school, and with the French confession. Though in his life Lælius professed to believe these doctrines, yet it appeared after his death, which took place 1562, in Switzerland, that a great part of his life had been spent in endeavours to destroy them. The manuscripts, which contained the heretical labours of a great part of his life, fell into the hands of his nephew, Faustus Socinus. It is impossible to tell where the uncle left off, and where the nephew began; however, as Lælius was confessedly a man of great genius and extensive learning, and as Faustus though possessed of considerable natural talents, was in a great measure illiterate, it is probable that the greater part of the works published by the latter, are from the pen of the former. He denied utterly the divinity of Christ Jesus, and maintained that he was a mere man, and never had any existence till he was conceived in the womb of the virgin: that he neither died for the sins of mankind, nor obeyed the law for them; that all men have power to do good works sufficient to save them; that the only atonement required by divine justice, consists in faith in God and his revelations, and in repentance; that there are no divine decrees, and that Christ's holiness of life, sufferings, and death

on the cross, were merely designed to set an example of purity of life and patience in affliction to his followers. All these and other heresies, he attempted to establish, at great length, and with much subtility of reasoning. After exhibiting great indecision and adopting many plans of life, Faustus settled permanently at Racow in Poland, which became the centre of his operations. Upon the publication of his uncle's manuscripts, with such additions or alterations as he may have made in them, many embraced the heresies with which they were filled, especially among the Poles. A great many of the nobility soon became Socinians. He published a manual called the Racovian Catechism, designed for the instruction of children. It does not clearly and unequivocally exhibit all his views, but like the operations of other heretics, evinces a determination to undermine the system of truth. The extent, to which the Socinian heresies have spread is truly alarming. The fate of Poland has not deterred thousands, in other nations, from embracing those blasphemies against the divinity of Messiah and the character of God, for which Jesus Christ, who rules the nations, has permitted the surrounding monarchies to rend in pieces this kingdom, that attempted to pluck the crown from his head. Never were the divine judgments more visibly inflicted upon the Israelitish empire, for its idolatries, than they have been upon Poland for her heresies. A large proportion of the reformed church in the Germanic empire, has been carried away with this destructive heresy. What has always happened in other cases may be expected in this, that those who reject the divinity of the Redeemer, should become lost to all sense, not only of genuine piety, but generally to all appearance of attention to the duties of religion. It was not until shortly before the almost entire destruction of the Austrian empire by the French armies, that the Socinian heresy had become common in Germany. The Rev. Dr. John Henry Young, well known, to the Christian world, by the conspicuous part which he took in the Germanic Bible societies, and who was for

many years professor of anatomy and optics in the college of Marburgh, says in his "*Grauer Man*," a work published about the beginning of the present century, that a professor of divinity, who was delivering a course of lectures on theology, concluded one set of lectures by saying that "he hoped he had completely set aside the claims of Christ Jesus to divine honours, and that he would endeavour, in a few lectures, to clip the wings of the Holy Ghost." Such revolting blasphemy, one would have thought, could never have entered into the heart of man, much less have escaped from the lips of any one making a profession of any thing bearing the least resemblance to Christianity. But when reported by such a man as Dr. Young, no one can doubt of its truth. Indeed, if the opinions of Socinus and his disciples were true, there would be nothing impious or even improper in it. In Prussia, where there were once five hundred ministers of the reformed church, most of them orthodox, most of them of the Genevan school, the pulpits are opened to both Socinians and Jews, who, from the sacred desk, are permitted to hurl their blasphemies against the Son of God and his atoning sacrifice. Many of the protestant clergy in Prussia and Germany are not Socinians only, but are expressly and avowedly deists, who have taken holy orders with no other view than to gain a living. What was the point at which they first began to diverge from the path of truth? Precisely that at which, the Salmurensian divines commenced their career of ruin—the doctrine of a definite atonement. When men once leave the path of truth, the farther they travel the more widely do they stray. Arminianism, we have seen, is the high road to deism. This might be illustrated in the character of individuals, as well as of nations and churches. More than one of those who embraced the Armininian errors in France became deists. The celebrated Grotius wrote against Socinus, and was replied to by Crellius, a distinguished Socinian writer. Grotius adopted some of the Arminian errors, and though he never avowed himself a disciple of his antagonist, yet the manner in which he attempted to explain away most of the passages,

which plainly teach the divinity of Jesus, afford strong presumption that he went over to the camp of the enemy, and some say he died a deist. Robinson, the learned and elegant translator of Saurin's sermons, first receded from the truth by embracing Arminian errors, and never halted in his career, until he adopted the Socinian creed, or rather the deistical, and wrote a large book to prove that for many hundreds of years there was in reality no church of God, and that ministers do not derive their office by succession from the apostles.

While error was spreading in Holland, by Arminius and his disciples; in France, from the Saumur; and heresy from Racow, in Poland, the school of Geneva for a great many years preserved its attachment to the system of the reformers, without the least deviation. The successors of Calvin and Beza, were learned, illustrious and devout men. Among the most distinguished of these for learning, industry, and piety, were the Turrettins. One of them the Rev. Benedict Turrettin, was a delegate in one of the general synods of France. Francis Turrettin, the author of the body of divinity, from which we propose to present translations, on the subject of the atonement, to our readers, was professor of theology in Geneva, and pastor of the church in that place, for many years before and until the time of the revocation of the edict of Nantz. For various erudition, great industry, zeal for the truth, and ability to support it, by scripture and reason, he never was excelled by any of the distinguished divines who were in that seminary, not even by Calvin himself. He has left four large quarto volumes, containing each about eight hundred pages, which contain a very complete vindication of the doctrines of grace, against all the most prominent errors that have plagued the church. No where will the student of theology find so masterly a refutation of all those errors, and so luminous a display of the genuine truths of the gospel, as in the writings of this great and good man. Every student of divinity should read and digest well the whole of his writings, and thus lay up for

himself a treasure of theological knowledge, upon which he may draw during all his future life.

Francis Turrettin, the grand-father of the professor, was the first of the family who settled in Geneva, which place he fixed upon as his residence, on account of the excellent opportunities there presented, for improvement in Christian knowledge, as exhibited by the divines who taught in the school of Calvin. For many years, Benedict Turrettin, the father of the younger Francis, performed with extraordinary reputation, the duties of professor of theology and pastor of the church in Geneva. Francis Turrettin was born in 1623. He entered early upon his education, and visited the most celebrated schools in Germany, Holland, and France. He heard the lectures of Cappel, La Place, and Amyraut, at Saumur, but rejected the hypothesis of the latter, adhering, with undeviating firmness, to the doctrines which Calvin, and his father had taught at Geneva. In France also, he studied natural philosophy and mathematics, under the celebrated Gassendi, and became acquainted with many of the most distinguished literary men, who at that time formed a most brilliant constellation. In 1647, soon after his return to Geneva, he was ordained to the ministry, and in the year following was chosen pastor of the church. In Geneva there were many French and Italians; his family was originally from Parma, and he preached with ease and fluency, in several languages. His eloquence was of a most persuasive and irresistible character, and under his ministry the church flourished in a very high degree. In 1653, he was made professor of theology in the academy, where he was united with the celebrated Tronchinus, Antony Seger, and Philip Mæstraeht, all of whom co-operated with him in advancing the cause of truth, as taught by their predecessors, and in refuting the numerous errors and heresies which were then making great inroads upon the church.

The work on theology of which an account has been given above, comprises the substance of the lectures which he read from the theological chair of the academy, the splendour of whose character was well supported during his

life. He was either personally acquainted with the most distinguished divines and scholars of his age, or corresponded with them, both in Latin and their native languages.

He died in 1687, at the very time when thousands of the French protestants were flying to Geneva, from the dreadful storm of persecution that had burst upon them after the revocation of the edict of Nantz.

He was succeeded in the theological professorship by his nephew Benedict Pictete, who filled, with great reputation, the honourable station to which he was advanced. His system of theology,* published in French, is substantially the same with that of his uncle Mr. Turrettin. He did not depart from the faith of his ancestors, nor diminish the reputation of his family.

The degree of learning diffused among the people of Geneva, through the instrumentality of the academy, is almost incredible. Even the peasantry and servants spoke Latin with very considerable propriety. Sound literature and correct theological views, in Christian countries generally go hand in hand. One may and often does flourish, where the other languishes for some time. But sound theology usually elevates the literary character of a people, while heresy, by introducing immorality and a neglect of the Holy Scriptures, scarcely ever fails in the end, to degrade literature. With all the boasted improvements of Europe during the last century, the greater part of European literary men, if we except chemists, are at the present time mere smatterers compared with Calvin, Du Moulin, Grotuis, Gassendi, Amyraut, Spanheim, Turrettin, Pictete, and Owen. Geneva was the centre from which literature, as well as sound theology, diffused itself among all the reformed churches in Europe. What the state of orthodoxy is at present in Geneva, we have no means of very accurate information, but we do not hesitate to say, it contains more orthodoxy in proportion to the number of its inhabitants, than any other city of Europe. While Poland, on account of her heresies and blas-

* We understand that the Rev. Dr. Green is now engaged in translating this system.

phemies against Messiah, has been ground to dust, and scattered to the four winds, the sport of tyrants; and while the other empires of Europe have been convulsed to their centres, and deluged with blood, Geneva has enjoyed comparative repose, under the protection of Messiah. Such views as these need no apology to those who are familiar with scripture history.

In Holland too, the seminaries of the Calvinistic school, maintained long their integrity, and indeed from the latest accounts, they do so in some measure even to the present time. The works of Witsius, Spanheim, Rivetus, Des Marets, Salmasius, Heinsius, Triglandius, Hornbeck, Hoton, Goetius, Æmelius, and others, who were of the Genevan school, have been like salt in preserving the Belgic churches, and have in some measure saved them from the corruption which has almost ruined most other protestant churches on the continent.

In the north of Europe, we have reason to hope, that very considerable progress is making in the diffusion of a knowledge of divine truth. Platon, the late Metropolitan of Moscow, in his exhibit of the doctrines of the Russian Greek church, states, explicitly, his belief in the divinity of Christ Jesus, and his atonement as the only hope of the sinner, and also of the necessity of faith in him, in order to salvation. These views he gives, not merely as his own personal opinions, but as those of the Russian church, and the book is extensively read and referred to as a standard work in Russia*.

The opinions respecting the atonement, which have been held by the divines of the British empire, have not yet been mentioned. They have been purposely reserved that they might be presented in one connected view. Here a vast body of facts offer themselves, from which but a few can be selected.

Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, in his book concern-

* Mr. Daschkoff the Russian ambassador informs me, that the greatest reliance may be placed on this book, as giving an accurate view of the doctrines of the Greek church, and that it is well translated.

ing the Virgin, and original sin, says:—"Some say if all are not polluted by Adam's sin and chargeable with it, how can it be asserted that no one can be saved without a satisfaction made for the sin of Adam? For how can a just God demand from them a satisfaction, which they have not? To which I reply that God does not demand from any sinner more than he owes. But because no one has power to pay as much as he owes, Christ alone, has paid for all who shall be saved, more than is due." Here we have the doctrine of atonement asserted in as plain terms as words can express it. We have also the extent of the atonement, "for all who shall be saved," from which we discover that he did not maintain that Christ, for all men as well those who are saved, as those who are damned, paid the price of redemption. He lived towards the end of the eleventh century, and considering the station which he occupied, the influence which he had over the church in Britain, and the attention which he paid to the subjects upon which he wrote, we cannot entertain a doubt but that the language, which he uses both here and in other parts of his book, expresses the opinions which were generally held at that time by British Christians.

But in Britain, as well as in nearly all other countries of Europe, most of the professors of religion, in a great measure lost sight of the efficacy of the atoning sacrifice of Messiah, and placed their reliance for salvation, upon the observance of unmeaning or criminal ceremonies, and the absolution of priests, until their eyes were opened by the reformation, which dawned early upon the British isles. The name of John Wickliff, is known to every one who has the least acquaintance with the history of Great Britain. He was celebrated by his contemporaries as a man of profound erudition, and uncommon genius; and, for that age, he was doubtless an extraordinary man. He filled the theological chair in the college of Oxford; and his first appearance before the public in such a manner as to attract much public notice, was in the year 1360, one hundred and sixty years before Luther began his reformation in Germany. In that year he

appeared as a champion for the privileges of the University. While engaged in this controversy he dared to utter some censures against the Roman pontiff, which provoked the vengeance of the catholic monks and bishops. In 1367 he was degraded from his office in the University. He appealed to Urban V. who confirmed the sentence that had been pronounced against him. He now threw off all restraint, attacked the monks, and exposed, with great boldness, the profligacy of their lives. He did not stop here, for though his views were rather obscure, yet he taught that men must rely upon the atonement of Christ Jesus alone for salvation, and that every other ground of hope must prove fallacious. He was persecuted, but his opinions spread extensively, and he had many followers, who were called Wickliffites. He died in 1387. All he did was but like the shedding of a few rays upon the darkness of the night, rendering the darkness visible.

What he effected, however, paved the way for the introduction of a more correct knowledge of the system of grace into the British empire, at the time of the reformation. The chief instrument in the hand of Providence for effecting this glorious work was John Knox, who, next to Luther, and Calvin, has been the most distinguished mark for the shafts of ridicule and calumny, by infidels, heretics, and other ungodly men. This illustrious reformer was born in 1505, five years after Charles V., emperor of Germany, at Haddington, in Scotland. He was descended of respectable parentage, and commenced his liberal education at the grammar school in Haddington. From this school he was transferred to the university of St. Andrews, where he commenced, at nineteen years of age, his collegiate course in the college of St. Silvador, at the same time with George Buchanan. He made great progress in his studies, and manifested peculiar facility in the study of languages, especially the Greek, in which he made uncommon proficiency. Both he and Buchanan were disgusted with the scholastic jargon, which occupied so conspicuous a place in the seminaries at that time, and betook themselves to other sources of improve-

ment. Knox, read with great interest, the writings of Jerome and Augustine, especially the former. He soon perceived that the doctrines of religion had been entirely corrupted, by the catholic clergy; that in Scotland, little more of Christianity than the name had been retained, and to this corruption, as its genuine source, he attributed the shameful profligacy of the clergy, which exceeded perhaps that of every other country in Europe. Before this time indeed a gleam of light had shone upon Scotland, through the preaching of Mr. Patrick Hamilton, a noble youth who had gone to Germany, induced by the fame of Luther, and had returned to Scotland to expose the corruptions of the church. He was persecuted, and received the crown of martyrdom in the year 1528. While Knox was employed in search of truth with a noble independence, he met with Mr. George Wishart, who was of a most amiable character, a very devout man, had embraced the protestant religion, and was of great use in giving Knox correct views of the system of grace. About the year 1549, he went to Geneva and heard the lectures of Calvin, whose views of the doctrine of the atonement, of the divine decrees, of faith, and of church government, he fully embraced. Upon his return to his native country, he proclaimed the doctrines of grace, as taught in the Geneva school, with a boldness, which excites a high degree of admiration in the mind of every enlightened Christian. His great theme was the excellency of the atonement, on which he descanted with a most commanding eloquence, and with astonishing effect. Thousands of all orders embraced his doctrines, became advocates for his plan of church government, and renounced the Roman catholic religion. The sword of persecution awoke, but nothing could check the progress of truth. The prospects of salvation through the atonement of Messiah, were like the cheering beams of the morning sun after a dark and tempestuous night, and as well might the enemies of the atonement have attempted to impede the progress of the car of day, as to check the march of the reformation. The result of the popish opposition to the truth, were civil wars which

agitated the whole nation, and the effect of the gospel was, in this case, what Christ predicted it should be, to set a man against his father, the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law, &c. But all hastened the progress of the light. Hundreds died upon the scaffold, exulting in the hope of a blessed immortality obtained through the mediation, obedience, death and intercession of Christ Jesus. Indeed all the martyrs, who laid down their lives for the truths of Christianity, from the proto-martyr Stephen, to the earl of Argyle, in Scotland, give testimony to the truth and value of the atonement; which supported them amidst all their cruel tortures, and enabled thousands to sing in triumph over death even in the midst of the flames.

While things were thus advancing toward the abolition of popery in Scotland, the head of the church was by the dispensations of his Providence, preparing the way in England for the promotion of truth. King Henry VIII. was upon the throne of that kingdom at the same time that Charles V. reigned in Germany, and Francis I. in France. He had married Catharine of Arragon, the sister of Charles V. Catharine, before her marriage to Henry had been contracted to his brother, which afforded him a pretext, when he formed an attachment to Ann Bolyn, to seek a divorce from her, which according to the notions of those times among catholics, could only be obtained from the Roman Pontiff. To the pope Henry made application, but he was unwilling to offend so powerful a monarch as Charles V., and refused to grant the dispensation. The king was resolved that he would not be thwarted in his project, but at the advice of Cranmer, whom he elevated about the same time to the rank of archbishop, to promote his views applied to the colleges and universities of Britain and of other kingdoms of Europe for advice. They were unanimously of opinion, that a man could not legally marry his brother's wife. Henry proclaimed the British empire independent of the see of Rome, and divided between himself and his archbishop, that power over all ecclesiastical af-

fairs, which had been claimed and granted before to the pope.

We mention these events to shew the provision which the great Head of the church had made, to prepare the way for introducing into England a knowledge of the way of salvation, through Jesus Christ. Light from the continent of Europe, and from Scotland, began to shed its beams upon England. Archbishop Cranmer, though in some things defective, was a very learned and pious divine. He taught the doctrine of atonement in the most explicit terms, it runs through every thing he wrote. He also invited learned men from the continent to the university of Oxford, and patronised the cause of letters generally throughout the kingdom. He made a translation of the scriptures into the English language, and had editions of it printed so cheap as to place it in the reach of the poor. The effect of the diffusion of the oracles of truth among the common people was a means of leading them to a belief in the doctrine of the atonement. However heretics may wrest the scriptures, and by subtilty of argument bewilder themselves, and those who are fond of their curious and sophistical speculations, the common people always derive from them the doctrine of salvation by Jesus Christ, not only as a prophet instructing them, and as a king governing them, but as a priest making atonement for the sins of his people. The circulation of the scriptures, among the English peasantry, was one of the noblest works effected by Cranmer. He also applied himself to the formation of a confession of faith for the English church. This celebrated system has since been known by the name of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. It asserts in the strongest terms the doctrine of the trinity, the equality of the Son and Holy Ghost with God the Father, the substitution of Christ Jesus in the room of the sinner, and his perfect satisfaction made to the law of God, to the divine justice; and that by the imputation of his righteousness to the sinner, who by faith accepts of it as offered in the gospel, justification, consisting of pardon of sin and acceptance

with God as righteous, is procured, and that all this salvation is applied and rendered effectual for salvation by the agency of the Holy Spirit.

These articles were never fully adopted, nor generally received in the church of England during the reign of Henry VIII. who manifested no regard for the interests of true religion, either in his own person, or among his subjects. The clergy when he ascended the throne were not only shamefully ignorant of every thing which resembled Christianity in theory, but were in a high degree profligate in their lives. In every kingdom of Europe, and no where more than in England, the monks were the opprobrium of religion, and the scorn of all sensible men. The king suppressed monasteries, and a part of their revenues was divided between the crown and the nobility, and the remainder given to the monks for their support, but no provision was made in any effectual manner for the supply of able and learned spiritual instructors. Hence, nearly all that was done, for the propagation of correct principles, among the people, was through the medium of the word of life, without the aid of living instructors, and so few could read, that the effects produced by the scriptures were not so great, as we might at first view imagine. Such was the caprice and tyranny of Henry, that no steady measures, which the archbishop suggested, and wished to carry into operation, could be pursued. The people, however, began to be generally convinced that the priests could not save them.

In 1547, Cranmer was freed from the tyranny and caprice of the master who had elevated him to his high rank, by the death of Henry VIII., and he now exerted himself with very great vigour in promoting the cause of reformation. We have said that Cranmer encouraged learning, and learned men. With the concurrence of the regent, who governed the kingdom during the minority of Edward VI., son of Henry VIII., those learned protestants, Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, Paul Fagius, and Emanuel Tremellius were placed in Oxford college. These distinguished

men brought with them the doctrines relative to the atonement, that they had learned in the school of Luther, and they taught them to numerous youth of the most powerful families in the kingdom, who resorted to Oxford. This measure had a happy effect in a two fold way, by communicating, through the medium of the youth, a knowledge of the way of salvation into the first families in England, and by securing the education of young men, to furnish the church with a learned ministry. All other events, even the translation of the Bible and its circulation in the English language, were little more than preparatory to this measure, which produced a most extensive and powerful effect. With all the exertion of the primate and the efforts of the learned protestants, whom he had brought over from the continent to aid him, the progress of truth was still slow. The clergy were unwilling and unable to instruct the people, who were sunk into the lowest state of ignorance.

Soon after the death of Henry VIII., John Knox, whose fame had spread extensively in England, being released from the French gallies, in which he had been confined, visited London, where he was received with every mark of respect and friendship by the archbishop, to whom as well as to the privy council, his late sufferings had greatly recommended him. He preached, with his usual zeal, and to vast audiences, the doctrines in which he had been instructed from the word of God, both in his native country and at Geneva. He was appointed to preach at Berwick, on the borders between the two kingdoms, by which he had it in his power to be instrumental in leading many people of both kingdoms, from the Catholic church, and instructing them in the knowledge of that salvation, which is by Christ Jesus.

As soon as Edward ascended the throne, he used his utmost exertions to promote the protestant cause, of which he was a warm friend, and pious professor. He appointed six protestant chaplains, two of whom were to preach to himself and his court, while the other four were to itinerate

through the kingdom and supply the place of those lazy and ignorant bishops, who neglected their flocks. One of those was Knox, whose instrumentality in advancing the cause of truth during his residence in England was very great. The thirty-nine articles, and the liturgy generally, a great part of which was taken from the Augsburgh Confession and Liturgy, and had been compiled by Cranmer, was adopted, and by authority fully introduced into the church during the short reign of Edward. Knox was consulted on this occasion. Some of those who were active in bringing the liturgy into use, were for retaining in it the doctrine of the corporeal presence in the Eucharistic bread and wine; but, through the influence of Knox, it was expunged, and also the practice of kneeling, at the reception of the elements. It is now time that from the standards of the church of England, we should lay before the reader a few selections, relative to the subject of atonement; and first of original sin, the fountain whence flow all the evils which render a satisfaction necessary. The Homily on the misery of man has these words:—" In ourselves (as of ourselves) we find nothing whereby we may be delivered from the miserable captivity into which we are cast through the envy of the devil; by breaking God's commandment in our first parent Adam." The same Homily asserts that we cannot deliver ourselves from the consequences of the fall by any power of our own. " We cannot think a good thought of ourselves, much less can we say well, or do well of ourselves." Of this original guilt it says again:—" Wherefore he," (*i. e.* David) " says, Mark and behold I was conceived in sins; he saith not sin, but in the plural number, sins; forasmuch as out of one as a fountain spring all the rest." The Homily on Christ's nativity, is clear and full to the same point. " As before he," (Adam) " was most beautiful and precious, so now he was most wretched and vile in the sight of the Lord his Maker. Instead of the image of God, he was now become the image of the devil; instead of the citizen of heaven, he was now become the bond-slave of hell, having in himself no one part of his former purity and

cleanness, but being altogether spotted and defiled, insomuch that he now seemed to be nothing else but a lump of sin, and therefore by the just judgment of God condemned to everlasting death."

The ninth article is entitled, "Of original sin," which it thus defines; "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk) but it is the fault of the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit." Lest it should be thought that by all these expressions, no more is intended than the derivation of corruption from Adam fallen, while we are not accountable for his violation of the covenant, the Homilies assert "that we are by nature children of wrath, but we are not able to make ourselves inheritors of God's glory." Again; "We are all miserable persons, damnable persons, justly driven out of Paradise, justly excluded from heaven, justly condemned to hell." As if the writers of the standards of the English church found it difficult to express, in the English language the greatness of this sin, they heap epithet upon epithet, so as to put their meaning beyond all doubt. Hence the Homily on the nativity of Christ—"Before Christ's coming into the world, all men universally in Adam, were nothing else but a crooked generation, rotten and corrupt tares, stony ground, full of brambles, and briars, lost sheep, prodigal sons, naughty and unprofitable servants, unrighteous stewards, workers of iniquity, the brood of adders, blind guides, sitting in darkness, and the shadow of death; to be short nothing else, but children of perdition, and inheritors of hell." All this is not merely of themselves or by actual transgression, but in Adam, that is, if language have any meaning, by the guilt of Adam's sin in breaking the covenant of works, being imputed to them. Listen again to the tremendous language of the Homilies, which, strange to tell, many swear to maintain, and yet are Arminians, who deny the doctrine of ori-

ginal sin. "Neither he" (Adam) "nor any of his, had any right, or interest at all in the kingdom of heaven, but were become plain reprobates, and cast-aways, being perpetually damned to the everlasting pains of hell fire." Than all this, nothing could possibly be more decisive. It is perfectly the doctrine of the Genevan school.

That man cannot, in his own person, make satisfaction to the divine justice, is taught with the same precision. The homily on the misery of mankind, instructs the worshipper, "that his own works are imperfect," and then, it adds, "we shall not stand foolishly and arrogantly in our own conceits, nor challenge any part of justification by our merits or works." The homily on salvation says, "Justification is not the office of man, but of God, for man cannot make himself righteous by his own works, neither in part nor in whole; for, that were the greatest arrogancy and presumption of man, that antichrist could set up against God, to affirm that man might by his own works, take away and purge his own sins, and thus justify himself." Quotations to the same effect might be greatly multiplied, but what we have made are amply sufficient to prove, that those who composed the homilies, if they understood English, intended to say that unless help for fallen man was laid upon some one more mighty than man himself, there was nothing for him but everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power. Original sin as taught in the Calvinistic school, the total depravity and utter inability of man to help himself are as clearly and explicitly taught here as in any of the works of Calvin, or in the confessions of any of the Calvinistic churches.

As to the manner in which we are justified, the homily on salvation asserts, that "we be justified by faith only," which is more fully explained in the following words—"We put our faith in Christ that we be justified by him only, that we be justified by God's free mercy, and the merits of our Saviour Christ only, and by no virtue or good works of our own that are in us, or that we can be able to have or to do for to deserve the same; Christ himself only being the meri-

torious cause thereof." What is this but a total exclusion of our own good works, and a full and explicit assertion of the merits of Jesus as the only ground of our justification before God? Shall the church of England continue to decry Calvin, and the Genevan school, while her own homilies, which all her own clergy and the officers of the British government must swear to support, teach the same doctrines that were taught in that celebrated school?

The eleventh article is also explicit on the same point: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, by faith and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the homily on justification." But the homilies do not stop here; they contain, in clear and precise terms, the doctrine of imputation. The view which the scriptures present of this subject is, that Jesus Christ from eternity, in the covenant of grace undertook as the representative of his spiritual seed, to pay the debt which they should, after their fall in Adam, owe to the divine justice, by suffering in their room, what they deserved, and fulfilling the law which they would be unable to do in their own persons, and thus pay the price of redemption for them, as their legal representative. Hence when the believer, by faith accepts of this righteousness offered in the gospel, it becomes his own, and because it is his own, as much as if he had wrought it out for himself, it is imputed to him for his justification. This grand and consolatory doctrine lies at the very foundation of all our hopes of acceptance with God and a blessed immortality. It is so exhibited in the homilies of the English established church. Hear the homily on the salvation of mankind: "The price of our redemption, is by the offering of his" (Christ's) "body and the shedding of his blood, with fulfilling of the law perfectly and thoroughly." And again it adds, "the justice of God, consisteth in paying our ransom and fulfilling the law." In the same homily it is farther expressed in these words:—"He" (God) "provided a ransom for us, that was

the most precious body and blood of his own most dear and beloved son Jesus Christ, who, besides this ransom, fulfilled the law for us perfectly." Again—"The end of his (Christ's) coming was to save and deliver his people, to fulfil the law for us, &c." Still more explicitly it states the formal cause of our justification to be, "the gracious imputation of God the Father, accounting his Son's righteousness unto the sinner, and by that account making it his to all effects, as if he himself had performed it." No sophistry can explain away, no art elude the force of this explicit declaration. On the subject of the extent of the ransom, or in relation to those for whom the ransom was offered, there is nothing very explicit in the articles; but it may be asked, how can the law be "*perfectly fulfilled*," and the ransom fully paid to divine justice for any sinner, and yet that sinner, to all eternity, be compelled to suffer, in his own person, the punishment due to his sins, and thus pay a second time the ransom, which Christ had paid for him in his life and at his death? Is not this to offer an indignity to divine justice, and to represent God as doing that which a virtuous man would not do? It may be said the ransom is paid and liberation offered to the sinner in the gospel, but that he by unbelief rejects the offered salvation, and thus must suffer for the rejection. This would not solve the difficulty with respect to the heathen who have never heard of Christ Jesus. Again, with respect to those who hear the gospel, their rejection is a sin, and if Christ paid the ransom for all the sins of all mankind, he must have satisfied for this sin. But if it be said he satisfied justice for all sins except unbelief, what then is gained by his satisfaction for only a part of our sins? Nothing surely. But every man is guilty of unbelief until the day in which he believes; hence, as according to the homilies, all his sins are pardoned on account of the righteousness of Christ, his past unbelief, must have been atoned for; and hence Christ must have made satisfaction for this as well as other sins. It is impossible then to make the homilies consistent with themselves, without attributing to them the doctrine of a definite atonement.

That such was the opinion of their compilers, there can be little doubt.

This is farther elucidated by the doctrine which they teach relative to the regeneration of the sinner. The homily for rogation week, hath these words:—"Let us, therefore meekly call upon that bountiful Spirit, the Holy Ghost, which proceedeth from our Father of mercy, and from our mediator Christ, that he would assist us, and inspire us with his presence, for without his lively and secret inspiration, can we not so much as speak in the name of our mediator." This cannot mean merely the calling upon God with our mouths in the name of Christ, but must be understood of the prayer of the heart offered up to God through the Redeemer, which can proceed from the inspiration of the Holy Ghost only. To the same purpose speaks the homily on "a fruitful exhortation to the reading and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures." "The words of the Holy Scripture, be called words of everlasting life, for they be God's instrument ordained for the same purpose. They have power to turn us through God's promise, and they be effectual through God's assistance, and, being received in a faithful heart, they have ever an heavenly and spiritual working in them." Again, the homily for Whitsuntide:—"He that is the Lord of heaven and earth, of his great mercy so work in all men's hearts, by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, that the comfortable gospel of his son Christ, may be truly preached, truly received, and truly followed in all places." Farther:—"Man's human and worldly wisdom and science, is not needful to the understanding of the scripture, but the revelation of the Holy Ghost, who inspireth the true meaning unto them, that with humility and diligence search therefor." The seventeenth article, bears testimony to the same truth. "The godly consideration of predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themseves the working of the spirit of Christ mortifying the deeds of the flesh." Besides a very distinct assertion of the doctrine that the Holy Spirit works in us to the sav-

ing of the soul, we have here the doctrine of predestination, and of our election in Christ distinctly taught. A host of writers who have explained these articles, and who have exhibited their views of the doctrines of grace, might be quoted to the same effect: the works of divines who have been an ornament not only to the English church, but also to human nature. Now, how can Christ have fully paid the ransom, for those for whom he died, they be utterly unable to accept of the offer of salvation made in consequence of this payment, and the Holy Ghost's agency be necessary in the application of the purchased redemption, while Christ should be said to have died for millions, who never heard of this salvation, and for millions who have heard of it, to whom, yet the Holy Ghost, who alone can apply it bv working faith in the hearts, never does, and never will apply it? Are not all the operations of all the persons of the Trinity in harmony with each other? Surely. If God the Father willed the salvation of all men, and sent his Son to die for all men; if the Son willed the salvation of all and died for all, shall not the Holy Ghost also will the salvation of all? Most assuredly. But how can he be supposed to will the salvation of those to whom he does not apply the salvation which Christ has procured for them? There could not be a greater absurdity, unless it be the other side of the question, that though both God the Father and God the Son, wills the salvation of all, yet the Holy Ghost opposes their will and refuses to apply that salvation which the Father and Son wish him to apply. To make the homilies speak the language of Arminius, or even to maintain that they may be fairly interpreted in such a manner as to admit those who profess a belief in them to hold the Arminian errors, is to attribute to them impious absurdities. Yet strange as it may seem, thousands who have solemnly declared their approbation of them, hold even worse than all the errors of Arminianism.

Yet it must be admitted that the doctrine of a definite atonement, though fairly inferable from them, is not explicitly stated in the articles. Either the framers, had not

themselves very distinct views on the subject, which is far from improbable, or they purposely expressed themselves in a manner not very definite. We shall hereafter see, that the consequences of this loose manner of expression have not been less fatal in England than on the continent—that a flood of errors has poured into the church, to the destruction of both truth and holiness.

While the reformation was thus progressing in England, it was also continuing to advance rapidly in North Britain. The power of its enemies was gradually becoming more feeble. The continual civil wars rather promoted than retarded its progress. All the violent opposition of Queen Mary and her popish friends could not check its growth; even the very means which they devised for its destruction, accelerated its progress.

The Genevan confession of faith was adopted and sanctioned by the Scottish reformers. This instrument is very brief, but the doctrine of the atonement is fully and explicitly stated, so as that it cannot be misunderstood. Indeed it seems to have been justly considered the grand centre from which all the other doctrines of Christianity radiate. After exhibiting distinctly the doctrine of the Trinity, as at present taught in all the Calvinistic branches of the church, in the first article; the second article, is expressed in these words:—

"I believe, and confess Jesus Christ, the only Saviour and Messias, who being equal with God, made himself of no reputation but took on him the shape of a servant, and became man, in all things like unto us, sin excepted, to assure us of mercy and forgiveness, for when, through our father Adam's transgression, we were become children of perdition, there was no means to bring us from that yoke of sin and damnation, but only Jesus Christ our Lord, who giving us that grace, which was by his nature, made us through faith the children of God—and, forasmuch as he, being only God, could not feel death; neither being only man, could overcome death, he joined both together, and suffered his humanity to be punished with death, feeling in

himself the anger and severe judgment of God, even as if he had been in the extreme torments of hell, and therefore cried with a loud voice, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'

"Thus of his free mercy, without compulsion, he offered himself as the only sacrifice to purge the sins of all the world; so that all other sacrifices for sin are blasphemous, and derogate from the sufficiency hereof."

The doctrines of faith and regeneration, through the agency of the Holy Ghost, are the same with those taught by the standards of the English church. Indeed there can be no doubt, however many members of the British establishment employ their time in attempts to degrade Calvin, that the doctrines taught in the Articles and Homilies were originally derived partly from Geneva.

The Genevan confession, from which those extracts are taken, was adopted at an early period of the Reformation in Scotland, but the Scotch reformers did not stop here; they formed, for themselves a confession of faith which was adopted, as the Confession of Faith for the kingdom, by the parliament in the year 1560. It contains a very full and lucid exhibition of the Christian system; and is perhaps more perfect than any similar instrument formed by any of the churches, in the sixteenth century. That the views which it contains were chiefly derived from the Genevan school, through the instrumentality of Knox, there can be no doubt, as it was adopted nine years after he was invited by the nobility to return to Scotland, before which time he had been at Geneva.

The third article treats of original sin; and is in these words:—"By which transgression" (that of Adam) "commonly called original sin, was the image of God utterly defaced in man, and he and his posterity of nature become enemies to God, slaves to satan, servants to sin; insomuch that death everlasting hath had, and shall have, power and dominion over all that have not been, are not or shall not be regenerated from above; which regeneration is wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost, working in the hearts of

the elect of God, an assured faith in the promise of God, revealed to us in his word; by which faith, we apprehend Christ Jesus, with the graces and benefits promised in him." That all men will not be delivered from this state of corruption, into which by the sin of Adam, they are fallen, but those only who are elected of God in Christ Jesus, is plainly taught in the eighth article:—" For that same God and Father, who of mere grace, elected us in Christ Jesus his son, before the foundation of the world was laid, appointed him to be our head, our brother, our pastor, and the great bishop of our souls: but because that the enmity between the justice of God, and our sins was such, that no flesh by itself could, or might have attained unto God, it behoved that the Son of God should descend unto us, and take to himself a body of our body, flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone, and so become the Mediator between God and man, giving power to so many as believe on him, to become the sons of God, as himself also witnesseth, 'I pass up to my Father and your Father, unto my God and unto your God,' by which most holy fraternity, whatsoever we have lost in Adam is restored again, and for this cause we are not afraid to call God our Father." And in the ninth article they say; " that our Lord Jesus Christ offered himself a voluntary sacrifice to the Father for us, that he suffered contradiction of sinners, that he was wounded and plagued for our transgressions—that he suffered for a season the wrath of his Father, which sinners had deserved —that they are blasphemous against Christ's death, and the everlasting purgation and satisfaction purchased to us by the same," who affirm the contrary.

As to their views of the nature of the satisfaction made by Christ, nothing could be more satisfactory, nothing more decisive than those selections which have been laid before the reader, yet as to the extent and precise objects of the atonement, there is nothing here very specific; but the same reasoning which has been applied to the articles of the church of England, may be applied to the Scotch Confession. The Presbyterian form of church government, which gave all the

ministers, as co-presbyters, equal power, in the adoption of creeds, and put it out of the power of one priest, or a few priests, to alter the standards of the church; rendered it impossible to change the system, or introduce errors into it, without the consent of a majority of the clergy; and formed a strong barrier against the inroads of erroneous principles. The church too, was recognised at the same time, in Scotland as a regular and independent empire, of which our Lord Jesus Christ is the only king and head: and as a body possessing, by delegation from the Redeemer a right of self-government, and of regulating its system of doctrine and worship, agreeably to the principles contained in the scriptures of truth. All the civil concerns of the nation were, at the same time, rendered subservient to the interests of this kingdom of Messiah. The nation was considered as bound to regulate all its civil operations according to the laws of Heaven, revealed in the Bible. Thus we see advances made in the work of reformation at this early period, in North Britain, beyond any thing attained to in the continental churches and nations. We have a whole nation both in its civil and ecclesiastical capacity, professing a belief in the atonement of Christ, and the two great ordinances of social order among men—the ecclesiastical government and civil government, harmonizing in their pious efforts to extend, among all ranks, the knowledge of this salutary truth. All this was modelled upon a plan proposed by John Calvin, which he doubtless derived from the church of God under the Old Testament dispensation, and in which plan, he proposed to unite all Christian churches into one great visible society, holding the faith in unity, and rendering all things subservient to its promotion.

In England the case was very different. The monarchy was proud and powerful, not held in check by the nobility as in Scotland, but both claiming and exercising the power of controling the church in all her operations, regulating her creed, and imposing upon her such doctrines as it thought proper; and such a form of government as might

best subserve the interests of the throne, and increase its splendour. Hence, though under Elizabeth, who succeeded Edward VI., the knowledge of divine truth became more extensively diffused; and the mass of the people taught more generally, to place all their hopes of salvation, in the mediation and satisfaction of Jesus, while they relinquished all reliance on popish ceremonies, and priestly absolutions; yet the episcopal form of government as derived from the church of Rome, was still retained. In the shell which had contained the kernel of popish errors, was inclosed that of truth, which was tainted by the former corruptions; and that holy, spiritual worship, founded upon the atonement, as actually made, was never practised in England, to the same extent as in Scotland. Still there were, in the established church of the former, very many great and devout men, and besides these, a very powerful body of Christians ardently and zealously attached to the truths and the order of primitive times, who were known by the name of Puritans, and who were wholly adverse to the episcopal form of church government. They also embraced in the fullest manner the creed of the Genevan school, in relation to the doctrines of grace. They also contended for the liberties of the subject, in opposition to the despotic power of the crown, and thus rendered their cause popular. The spirit of the nation was roused, and the people assumed so high a tone, that an invitation was given to reform the church.

The act of parliament calling the assembly of divines at Westminster, passed on the 12th of June, 1643, and William Twisse was appointed by the parliament to be the moderator of that body. The express object of this clerical convocation, was to consult with relation to the doctrines, discipline, and worship of the church of England. Previously to this time the diffusion of learning through England, had been prodigious. The impulse was given about the time, when through the influence of Cranmer, the professors from the continent had been invited to Oxford university. Ancient languages, especially Latin, Greek and Hebrew, the physical sciences, and moral philosophy had been culti-

vated with remarkable success. The clergy especially, had become a very learned body, and they had contributed amply toward the elucidation of the system of grace, by applying the force of their genius, and their attainments in literature to biblical criticism. In no kingdom of Europe, were there so many truly learned and eminent men as in Scotland and England; and the nation generally had become sensible of the importance of divine truth. But the public mind was exceedingly distracted by the contending claims of opposing systems.

The ablest divines in England, with many distinguished members of parliament, were selected, as the members who were to compose the assembly. The number of divines was ninety-six, among whom we find the distinguished names of Calamy, Chalmers, Whitaker, Arrowsmith, Lightfoot, Gattaker, Burrows and Twisse. Commissioners were also appointed from Scotland, of their most distinguished divines, Henderson, Rutherford, Gillespie, Bailie and Douglass, and John, earl of Cassils, John Lord Maitland, and sir Archibald Johnston of Narristown. There was probably never a more splendid constellation of learning, talents and piety collected together than that which this assembly comprised. They met in king Henry VIIth's chapel, on the first of July, 1643. Besides various other instruments, relative to their system of ecclesiastical order, they formed that celebrated instrument, known by the name of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. For precision of thought, accuracy of arrangement, and correct views of the system of grace, the church has never been favoured with any uninspired works so perfect as these. This system is one of the most glorious fruits of the reformation.

We shall exhibit, on the doctrine of the atonement, a few extracts from it. The third chapter of the Confession relates to the divine decrees, in the fifth section of which we have these words:—" Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable

purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen, in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverence in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereunto, and all to the praise of his glorious grace."

And article sixth:—" As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore, they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ, by his Spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted and sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation; neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually justified, called, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only."

Article seventh:—" The rest of mankind God was pleased according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures; to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice."

Of original sin, they say (chap. iv, art. 2.) " By this sin," the sin of our first parents, " they fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and so wholly defiled in all their faculties, and parts of soul and body."

And in article fourth:—" From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to evil,—do proceed all actual transgressions."

Again article sixth:—" Every sin both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth, in its own nature, bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound even to the wrath of God, and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all its miseries, spiritual, temporal and eternal."

The views of the Westminster divines, in relation to the covenant entered into between the Father and the Son for the redemption of sinners from these evils, is expressed in the following words:—" Man, by his fall having made himself incapable of life by that covenant" (the covenant of works made with Adam) " the Lord was pleased to make a second, commonly called the covenant of grace: wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation, requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved, and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life his Holy Spirit to make them able and willing to believe."

To the same effect, in chapter eighth:—" It pleased God in his eternal purpose, to choose and ordain the Lord Jesus Christ, his only begotten son, to be the mediator between God and man; the prophet, priest and king, the head and saviour of his church, the heir of all things and the judge of the world, unto whom he did from all eternity give a people to be his seed, and to be by him redeemed, called, justified, sanctified and glorified." As to his accomplishment of this work, they say:—" This office, the Lord Jesus did most willingly undertake; which, that he might discharge, he was made under the law, and did perfectly fulfil it, endured most grievous torments in his soul, and most painful sufferings in his body; was crucified and died, was buried and remained under the power of death, yet saw no corruption. On the third day he arose from the dead, with the same body in which he suffered, with which also he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of his Father, making intercession, and shall return to judge men and angels. Jesus, by his perfect obedience, and sacrifice of himself, which he, through the eternal Spirit, once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him."

To complete this most perspicuous view of the plan of salvation, they thus express themselves:—" To all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption, he doth certainly

and effectually apply and communicate the same, making intercession for them, and revealing to them in and by the word the mysteries of salvation; effectually persuading them by his holy spirit to believe and obey; and governing their hearts by his Holy word and Spirit, overcoming all their enemies, by his almighty power and wisdom in such manner and ways as are most consonant to his wonderful and unsearchable dispensation.—Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; nor by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience, to them, as their righteousness, but imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ to them, they receiving and resting on his righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God.—God did from all eternity, decree to justify all the elect, and Christ did in the fulness of time, die for their sins and rise again for their justification: nevertheless they are not justified, until the Holy Spirit doth in due time, actually apply Christ unto them."

God has probably intended, by permitting men to introduce errors into the church, that the refutation of them should impart new light to the minds of men, in relation to the truths of his gospel. Though it is utterly impossible to render the doctrines of the divines of the orthodox school, who have employed their pens on the doctrine of the atonement, in composing ecclesiastical standards, consistent with themselves, on any other ground than that on which the divines at Westminster took their stand; yet it is certain, that we cannot any where find such luminous views of the system of grace as in the Westminster confession of faith. Had it not been for the errors of Arminius and his followers, which gave occasion for the synod of Dort, and for the discussions which took place in that venerable and illustrious body, we should not probably have had from those British divines so perspicuous a display of divine truth, as that which has been

just laid before the reader. The divines of Britain had taken a deep interest in the Arminian question, before and after the meeting of the synod of Dort, and the transactions of the synod had been published, and were extensively known in England and Scotland, before the meeting of the Westminster assembly. The Arminian errors, too, had travelled into Britain, and were embraced and defended both from the pulpit and the press; many of the British divines had entered the lists of controversy, and, with great force of argument, met and defeated the friends of this grand continental error. They had also an opportunity to avail themselves of all the writings, the confessions and creeds, of preceding reformers; and they had not failed to embrace it: hence it is not surprising that the work of reformation, at this period, should have advanced beyond any point to which it had previously attained. To this superior progress in the developement of the Christian system, Great Britain doubtless, owes her superiority in literature. As Geneva excelled in learning all other parts of the continent, so for the very same reason, Scotland and England, outstripped in their schools, in learned men, and in the general walks of literature, the whole continent. Those who employ their talents in illustrating the Christian system, have the most ample scope for the exercise of genius, and derive from their enquiries an expansion of thought, and a grandeur of conception, which increase their acumen, in researches even of a literary nature.

It was the intention of the distinguished men who formed the Westminster confession, together with a complete system of ecclesiastical order, to give to the whole as much permanency as possible. Accordingly all these doctrines received the sanction of Parliament, whose members as civil rulers, expressed their belief of them, and their resolution to adhere to them; and also that of Charles I. They moreover resolved to bind themselves and the whole nation by a solemn national and church covenant to maintain the truths exhibited in the standards which had been formed. In Israel, by the command of God, when any great defection had taken

place, and the king and the people returned to their duty, in order to confirm the reformation, and increase their confidence in each other's sincerity, the whole congregation entered into solemn covenant with God, and with one another, that they would adhere stedfastly to their duty. Such was the object of the covenant, in the days of Hezekiah. The churches and states on the continent, which had embraced the reformation, and had been pressed by enemies, had copied the example of the people of God in the days of old. The example too had been set for the whole British empire, by the kingdom of Scotland, which had entered into a national and church covenant in the preceding century. Upon the adoption of the Scotch confession, by the assembly of the church of Scotland, the king, the royal family, the nobility, and people, all united in a solemn bond, ratified by oath, to abide by the truths which it contained, invoking the divine aid and blessing upon the kingdom, and thus placing the nation under the protection of that Redeemer, through whose atoning sacrifice, they hoped as individuals to be saved. This instrument is known by the name of the National Covenant of Scotland. It was subscribed by the king 1530, and again renewed and solemnly approved in the years, 1638, and 1640.

These examples were imitated by the whole British nation, which bowed before the throne of Emmanuel, and cast down its crown at his feet, at the formation and ratification of an instrument binding the three kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, to continue in the profession of the truth as exhibited in their standards, and calling upon Jesus as king to grant his protection, assistance and blessing. All ranks of men, from the king upon the throne to the humblest cottager, subscribed this instrument. The divines of the assembly of Westminster, both houses of Parliament, and the assembly of the church of Scotland, subscribed this covenant, in 1643. It was again renewed with an acknowledgment of sins, and engagement to perform all the duties which it enjoined, by all ranks of society in 1648; by king Charles II, at Spey, June 23d, 1650; and again at Scoon,

January 1st, 1651. Here we behold a great empire, in all its departments, in the most solemn manner giving its full approbation to the doctrines of the Genevan school, and binding itself, by solemn oath, to adhere to these truths, and to oppose the contrary errors. All these great effects may be traced, in a good measure, to the instrumentality of the indefatigable of Calvin.

The doctrine of the atonement was the point from which all parts of this splendid reformation radiated, as from a common centre, in which they all inhered, and from which they derived their strength, when combined into a whole. But still there were two reasons, which prevented it from possessing that stability of character that would have been desirable. One was the character of Charles II. and of his courtiers; who were ambitious men, unacquainted with the power of the religion which was placed on the throne, and so hypocritical as to express in a most solemn manner, a belief in those truths which they did not embrace. The other was the state of the people, whose minds had not been sufficiently enlightened, nor their manners sufficiently reformed to induce them, as a body, to adhere to the truth at all hazards, and oppose with firmness the attempts of the throne to demolish the great fabric which had been erected. All had been effected, through the instrumentality and influence of a few choice minds, possessing great illumination and profound sagacity.

Every machine which could be put into operation by the crown, was set in motion to destroy the work which had been accomplished. When deception and duplicity were thought to be most effectual, they were employed, and open violence, injustice and cruelty, when they suited their steady purpose. It was for a short time only, that the king and his friends were permitted to prosecute these plans. In Scotland, there was a minority composed of the friends of popery, prelacy, and arbitrary government, who were hostile to the reformation. Cromwell invaded Scotland, and defeated the king's army under general Leslie at Dunbar, and the king was compelled to seek safety by flight to the continent. After

nine years exile he was restored through the instrumentality of general Monk, after the end of the presidency of Cromwell. The Rev. Mr. Douglas was the first person who proposed his restoration. At his restoration, Charles acted over again the same scene of hypocrisy.

During the government of Cromwell, the Independents, who reject episcopal and presbyterial government, and consider all ecclesiastical power to be vested in the hands of the minister and his congregation, prevailed in England. On the doctrine of the atonement, and indeed in every other point except that of church government, they adopted the creed of the Genevan school. Of this denomination was the *Rev. Dr. John Owen*, chancellor of Oxford University. He was a man of extraordinary learning, and industry, vast conceptions, profound knowledge of the Christian system, and fervent piety. He wrote and published between eighty and a hundred volumes, all of which were designed to illustrate the system of redemption, especially the doctrine of atonement. The Socinians, the Arians, the Pelagians, and the Arminians, were the adversaries, against whom he directed his heaviest artillery. His greatest work is a commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews, in four volumes folio. It is a work of stupendous labour, the whole of which may be considered as a dissertation on the doctrine of the atonement; in which he defends from the text of the apostle and collateral passages of scripture, the infinite dignity of the person of Messiah, who makes the atonement; the infinite value which it possesses; and proves that in its extent and object it is limited to those who were elected by God the Father from all eternity, and given to the Son, to be redeemed by him; and that all others are excluded. This he infers from the doctrine of substitution, illustrated by copious illustrations of the sacrificial ritual of the Jews, from the eternal covenant, from express declarations of scripture and from the justice of God. He also exhibits and amply proves the total depravity of human nature, and the utter incompetency of man to aid himself by his works, or to do any thing by which he can merit salvation. In early life, this

great divine read very extensively the ancient fathers of the church, studied with care the writings of the Jewish rabbins, and was intimate with the poets, philosophers, historians, and metaphysicians of the Grecian republics, and of the Roman empire. His treasures of learning were vast, and his mind of gigantic magnitude, and his conceptions grand. All these were laid under contribution in the execution of this work. Such a monument of learning, divinity, intellect and piety has never been erected by any other writer, to the honour of the British empire. His exercitations alone, preparing the way for his commentary, would fill more than one folio volume. In every work which he has left behind him, we trace the features of the same mighty mind, which fabricated the Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. *Owen* may be compared to Du Moulin of France, to Luther of Germany, to Witsius of Holland, to Calvin and Turrettin of Geneva. The nature of his works and their plan did not require him to be so systematic as Turrettin, and his mind was not probably trained to the formation of such a methodical digest, as that of the Genevan divine; in other respects, they were very similar to each other, lived at the same time, and, except on the article of church government, fully harmonized in their views of the doctrines of the system of grace. Owen's mind was not so polished nor his imagination so rapid, nor so chaste as that of Calvin; while he entered into the details of the work of redemption with more perspicuity than that divine. He was less copious and eloquent than Du Moulin, but he possessed more energy of native genius, more learning, and was more profound. He was more refined in his views and whole character than Luther, while in the boldness of his investigations, and in the rapidity of his intellectual operations, he was not quite equal to the German reformer. Witsius was more refined, more accurate, and more classical than any of the others, but inferior to them all in intellectual vigour, and depth of learning. The theological works of these five divines form a complete theological Encyclopædia. Men in our day talk of the improved state of theology. But what are all modern

divines compared to those wonderful men, who with many others of their cotemporaries and predecessors in the work of reformation, exhibited a vastness of mind, and an extent of learning which astonish us? The human mind, at that time, awoke from the slumber of ages, and performed achievements in exploring the treasures of science and religion, which command the admiration of all lovers of knowledge, while they awaken the gratitude of the pious to the God of grace, for his goodness in raising up such instruments to enlighten that, and each succeeding age.

All that was done by these illustrious men in Britain was almost destroyed by Charles after his restoration. He fell upon those very men who had been instrumental in his recal with all the merciless rage of persecution, abjuring all his solemn obligations—and breaking through ties the most sacred. The earl of Argyle, who placed the crown upon his head, and William Guthrie, a pious divine, who had been very active in his restoration, and had preached his coronation sermon, he beheaded. He embraced the Catholic religion, and shewed that he was animated by all its persecuting spirit. The people, always too ready to follow the example set by princes, together with the great body of the clergy, betrayed the cause of truth into the hands of the enemy.

The revolution which placed William and Mary on the throne of England, established the episcopal form of church government in England, and nominally made the thirty-nine articles the standard of doctrine, both in Ireland and England, while presbyterianism was established in Scotland. The sword of persecution was sheathed, but this was the only advantage which the church derived from this event. The profligacy which prevailed in the court during the reign of the house of Stuart, especially the latter part of it, and the general relaxation of principle, have continued to produce the most deplorable effects, ever since the present order of things has been established in Britain. The most monstrous errors and heresies have issued from the bosom of the established church, all which have, either in a greater

or less degree, attacked the doctrine of the atonement. The Arminian error, we have before remarked, early spread into England. Archbishop Laud, who, by his tyrannies, and murders, has rendered his character sufficiently notorious, was one of the greatest patrons of Arminianism. He would willingly have rendered the thirty-nine articles Arminian, but the state of public opinion would not permit him. Though these articles are Calvinistic, and form the creed of the British establishment, it is merely so in name. Men, while they must swear to support them, before they can be elevated to the dignities of either church or state, may and do hold, and publicly avow, sentiments directly hostile to them, even in points of capital importance. Many Arminian writers have attempted to pacify their consciences by elaborate works, designed to prove that in the articles there is nothing absolutely inconsistent with the Arminian creed. A great majority of the clergy of the episcopal church have been avowedly of the Arminian school, and a host of writers have employed their pens in dressing up in a new form, the very arguments of Arminius and his immediate disciples, which had been triumphantly refuted long before by Calvinistic divines, both in Britain and on the continent. At the head of these stands Whitby, who adopts all the doctrines exhibited by the remonstrating Arminians, at the synod of Dort, except that of perfectibility.

What has been experienced in all ages of the church, has been exhibited in the British established church:—those who have been the most clamorous for the moral powers of human nature, and for the efficacy of good works, have been the most deficient in performing them. The church has been overflown with immorality. Even the warmest friends of the episcopal establishment admit, that the life and power of religion have in a great measure departed from the majority of its professors. About the time of the meeting of the assembly of divines at Westminster, and even from the commencement of the reformation in Scotland, the reformers, both clergy and laity, were conspicuous for their attention to the practical duties of religion. The churches

were crowded, the performance of secret prayer, family devotion, and the instruction of children, both by heads of families and the pastors of the congregations, were attended to with great punctuality. Offences were comparatively rare, and discipline was exercised by church officers with vigilance and justice. Mere form was not sufficient to satisfy the Scottish and English reformers; they sought after experimental religion, and knew what it was. The pulpits were not occupied with hollow dissertations, on decency and morality, such as would have been more worthy of Epictetus or Seneca, than of Christian bishops; but the doctrines which improve the heart and promote vital godliness, such as Paul and his fellow apostles taught, were themes dealt upon by the reformed preachers. Men were sensible of their personal weakness and imperfection, acknowledged them, looked to God for aid, and received it. They did not hope to obtain salvation by their own good works, and thus render them hostile to the nature of the gospel dispensation; but relying upon the atonement, "practised holiness in the fear of the Lord," with a view to glorify the Redeemer and make themselves meet for the enjoyment of heaven.

At the time when the royal army and that of Cromwell were encamped against each other, every morning and evening the praises of God were heard along the whole lines of both armies, and prayers were offered up in the tents of the warriors. Modern infidels mock at all this as hypocritical cant, and so do graceless professors,—by which they only proclaim their own ignorance and impiety.

After the work of reformation was, in a great measure, undone, and the Arminian heresy became prevalent, the reverse of all this was exhibited in Great Britain,—on the throne, in the army, in the cabinet, and in the sacred pulpit.

A denial of the doctrine of the divine decrees, and of the definite atonement, was the point at which they began to diverge from the truth in the British islands, as we have seen the reformers doing on the continent; and like the continental backsliders, they did not stop here. The next step was Socinianism. All the Arminians did not indeed become

Socinians. Many who embraced the creed of Arminius, deplored the general laxity of morals and want of religion, which they saw prevailing in the episcopal church, and contended for the practice of the duties of religion. These people soon became a distinct class. While they adhered to the form of government in the church of England, and did not formally secede from their communion, they generally worshipped in societies collected together by harmony of views and feelings. They were distinguished by the name of Methodists. Their preaching, of the declamatory kind, consisted of warm and vehement addresses to the passions, mingled with great enthusiasm, and was directly the reverse of those cold, moral harangues, which were general among the episcopal clergy. They embraced in full the creed of Arminius, and pushed it even to greater extremes than its author. Indeed their zeal for it knew no bounds. Attempts to vindicate it were the chief doctrinal discussions which they mingled with their furious declamations. With all their extravagance, there was doubtless much real piety among them. They rather despised human learning than sought to cultivate it; and without hesitation licenced lay preachers, who appeared to be devout and to possess a talent for declamation. This even formed a part of their plan.

The great organizer and leader of this sect in England, was Mr. John Wesley, a man of strong passions, great zeal, indefatigable industry, and possessing much knowledge of human nature and of the means of governing men, but without much learning, or solid powers of intellect. He acquired a vast popularity, and extensive influence; and under his direction, the society increased rapidly. It is not astonishing that it did. All men are as naturally Arminians as they are naturally depraved. While Christians in the British established church did not possess the means of becoming acquainted with the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures through the public teachers of religion, and while they were justly displeased with the lukewarmness and even want of religion which characterised the great body of the English episcopal clergy, it was perfectly natural that they should

attach themselves to the methodist connexion, in which they found so much zeal for practical piety. Wesley's success led him on to extravagance. Many of his disciples affirmed, that they had arrived at that state of perfection, which he, after the Holland Arminians, asserted to be attainable by Christians in this life. These he collected into a species of monastery; but not long after it was established, the breaking out of the passions, and the most violent contentions among his perfect saints, both male and female, dissolved the establishment.

Augustus Toplady was the great antagonist of Wesley and the English Arminians. He translated from the Latin of Jerome Zanchius, a dissertation on the doctrine of divine decrees and definite atonement, and accompanied it with notes, in which there were contained a most triumphant refutation of Arminianism, and a tremendous castigation of Wesley. His satire is most severe, but sometimes he descends in his satirical remarks below the dignity of his subject.

The methodist society in England continues to stand at the present time on nearly the same ground that they occupied in the time of Wesley as to doctrine, while their numbers have greatly increased. They are perhaps the only instance of a society existing for a considerable length of time in the belief of the Arminian creed, without many of its members progressing into Arianism, or Socinianism. There are two causes for this. They possess few learned men, or writers who are able to pursue a train of reasoning, and follow out their creed into those heretical dogmas which necessarily flow from it when closely examined; and their attention is chiefly directed to mere practical exhortations, giving them little time to examine doctrines. Many of them are also pious, and would shudder at the heresies that grow out of their system. But whenever the clergy of this denomination become learned men and close thinkers, should such an event ever take place, they will, unless divine grace prevent, travel in the same path which their predecessors have done, into the regions of heresy and infidelity; or they

will retrace their steps, and embrace the doctrines taught by the Calvinistic divines, and derived from the sacred oracles.

While many of the more devout and zealous part of the Arminians in the episcopal church in England, ran into the enthusiastic extravagancies of the methodist society, the lukewarm and philosophical Arminian went on from attacking the doctrine of a definite atonement and divine decrees, to deny the doctrine altogether. They perceived that if the atonement is said to be made for all equally, and that it is from the exercise of the natural powers of man, that one is made to differ from another, then the salvation of the sinner, after all, depends upon his own exertions. If the sinner is saved by his own good works, why may he not as well be saved without an atonement? What need for the atonement? Why may not the sinner at once save himself by making an atonement for his sins through his own faith and repentance; and by his virtue and piety merit for himself the favour of God, and eternal glory, without all the machinery of a satisfaction, a Mediator, an application by the Holy Spirit, and an acceptance of it by the sinner, through faith? By a very natural train of reasoning from Arminian premises, they arrived at a conclusion entirely subversive of the atonement. This was not enough. Why, since they had found that there was no need of a satisfaction, should the Son of God assume human nature and endure all the sufferings of which the scriptures speak? Why such a stupendous event, when man can save himself? There was no way of answering satisfactorily these questions, but by denying that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, a divine person, and asserting that he was a mere creature, a mere man, in all respects like other men, but remarkably favoured by inspirations from the wisdom of his own intellectual powers. This conclusion many embraced, and became, as we have before remarked, open Socinians, who utterly reject the faith of the gospel.

Many of the clergy embraced these views, and maintained them in private life, while they did not dare to introduce them into their exhibitions from the pulpit. Others

taught them publicly; while some boldly separated themselves from the church, and attacked with great fury her articles, her whole creed, and her clergy. At Hackney there was a school, in which the greatest latitude of opinion and discussion was permitted on all points, and the students allowed to assail every doctrine of every school, either heathen, Christian, or infidel. This institution was under the direction of Socinians; and in it they educated youth for the ministry, with a view to prepare them for attacking the throne of Emmanuel, and plucking, if possible, the crown of divinity and universal government from his head. This school they were forced to discontinue, as the young men who had been thus drilled in the ranks of heresy, did not choose to be confined, in their operations, to the points to which their leaders wished to limit them. Multitudes boldly went over to the camp of the infidels, and openly renounced all belief in the divinity of the Holy Scriptures. The indignation of all Christians was aroused against an institution, that thus corrupted the youth of the kingdom, and it was abandoned.

As Wesley, on the one extreme, was the leader of the methodists, so Dr. Joseph Priestley became the most distinguished of all the disciples of the Socinian mania. He was born of pious parents, who believed the doctrines of the Calvinistic system, and who, in his infancy, instructed him in them. He tells us in his life written by himself, that when thinking on the doctrine of original sin, he found he could not repent of it; and from this exercise of his mind, he was led to doubt of its truth, and finally rejected it. His next step was to maintain, that Jesus Christ died for the sins of all mankind.* Here we find him precisely on the Arminian ground. In his Memoirs alluded to above, when speaking of this period of his life, he says, that a pious aunt with whom he lived was remarkably punctual in attending to the duty of prayer, and in enforcing it upon him; that this punctuality was disgusting to him; and he recommends to

* Memoirs of Dr. Priestley, Vol. I. p. 12.

parents not to be very strict in discharging this duty, least their children should contract a dislike to it.* This, truly, is worthy of the opinions which he embraced! After adoping the doctrine of an indefinite or general atonement, made for all mankind, he next became an Arian, and says that in a qualified manner he still believed a satisfaction for sin to have been made by Christ Jesus. He was placed in the school at Hackney, in which he imbibed a part of the heresies mentioned above, and was conspicuous for his industry, acuteness, and readiness in the defence of the various metaphysical and theological positions which he assumed. When he became Arian, he began to preach what he calls "*the unity of God;*" in other words, he began to preach against the doctrine of the trinity. It was not long until he totally rejected the doctrine of the atonement. The entire denial of this doctrine, he could not render consistent with the reasonings of Paul. With a boldness every way worthy of himself and the cause which he espoused, he immediately began to charge the apostle with unsound logic, and thought he found him guilty of drawing false conclusions from the premises which he had assumed. These critical remarks and reviews of the great apostle of the gentiles, he submitted in writing to some learned friend of the episcopal church, but was surprised at the narrowness of his views, in not relishing his castigation of the inspired oracles. Indeed, he did not satisfy himself with accusing *this* apostle of inaccuracy; other apostles and writers of the New Testament, he found to reason as badly as Paul. "At a profuse expense," says he,† "therefore of figures and allusions, fetched from the Jewish ritual, to make the new religion the better to tally with the old, liberties too great for our European manners, but not greater than the Jewish nation had been accustomed to, at the expense therefore of no sincerity or integrity, they suit their entertainment to those who were to be invited first to partake of it." In this sweeping sentence, he would

* Memoirs of Dr. Priestley, Vol. I. p. 14.
† Appendix to Vol. II. of his life, p. 579.

seem to include all the writers of the New Testament. How unlike must the doctor's system be to that of the apostles, to that of the Holy Scriptures, when he is forced thus to torture the oracles of the living God? One of two conclusions must here be drawn with respect to Priestley; either that he was a deist, or that he wilfully blasphemed the living God. The former is the more charitable inference. The result of his critical examination of the scriptures, was a persuasion that the writers were not inspired men; that they wrote merely as other men do, from the exercise of the powers of their own understanding; that the account which Moses gives of the creation of the world, was a mere theory, to be ranked with those of Fontenelle or Buffon, and that the portion of scripture in which it is recorded is to be compared with the fabulous ages of Grecian and Roman history; that the story of the miraculous conception is all untrue, whether introduced as a pious fraud by the evangelists, or interpolated by succeeding writers, he does not exactly state; and that there is no such thing in any instance as supernatural influence, from the Spirit of God, or from any angel, good or bad.

He opened a school for the education of youth after he began to preach these heresies; but so good was the state of moral and Christian feeling in England, at that time, that he could not obtain pupils. He again made a similar attempt in another part of the kingdom, but failed from the same cause, notwithstanding his acknowledged talents and learning. Parents could not trust their childrin in the hands of a heretic. His most intimate friends were Franklin and Bentley, who he says "were unbelievers in Christianity, but of excellent taste, improved understanding, and good disposition."* His next step was to maintain that Christ was a mere man. As soon as he embraced this opinion, he attacked the Arians with great vehemence. In this downhill career, he was no doubt hastened by the instructions which he received from Dr. Turner of Warrington, a professed

* Priestley's Life, Vol. I. p 54.

atheist, whose pupil he was for some time. He was intimate in the house of Lord Shelbourne, where he acknowledges that the most of the company that he saw, was infidel and atheistic. Such were the natural and appropriate associations of the Socinian doctor. He almost every year published a book, or several pamphlets. His rage for overturning every thing sacred was prodigious. The effusions of his pen are loose, often inaccurate, void of discrimination, but generally plausible, and sometimes eloquent.

He laid the greatest stress upon his History of Early Opinions, in which he attempts to make it appear, that the greater part of early Christians denied the divinity of Christ, and the doctrine of the atonement. His great antagonist was Dr. Horsely, who even in the opinion of Priestley's friends, gained a victory over him, not only in relation to early opinions, but on other great points of the Socinian system. Bishop Horsely indeed, with regard to early opinions, has left little to be done by those who follow him.

Dr. Priestley was not only anxious to overturn every doctrine which had been embraced by the British reformers, but, in subserviency to this ruling passion of his mind, laboured to overturn the British government too, and wished to see such a revolution as was going on in France. He became obnoxious to the mob, and suffered greatly from the riots at Birmingham; to the government, and to all Christians, and thence came to the resolution to emigrate to America; where we shall hereafter see him making a figure, prosecuting his chemical researches with assiduity, and propagating his heresies to some extent, with dreadful success.

The sect of Quakers arose about the middle of the seventeenth century, at the time of the civil commotions, in England. Its founder was George Fox, a shoemaker, a wild fanatic, who, by his extravagancies, attracted general attention, and soon collected around him a great number of followers. He and his disciples, at first, had no system of principles, and were agreed only in the rejection of the doctrine of a definite atonement, and in embracing the creed of

Arminius in relation to the moral power of man, the divine decrees, and original sin. To this they soon added the doctrine, that every man has a light within him from the spirit of God, by which he may be guided infallibly in the way of righteousness; and maintained that this light is of more importance for the direction of human conduct, than the Holy Scriptures. When all this is stripped of its mystical dress, it amounts to the same thing as the free-will of the Pelagians and Arminians, or the ability which they say every man has to obey all the commands of God. It is the same with the moral powers of the Socinians and Arians. The visionary mystic and the ungodly philosopher unite in attempting to elevate human rectitude, and to make the grace of God of none effect. They differ only in the costume in which they array their systems.

The first disciples of Fox were altogether illiterate, and recommended their heresies to illiterate men by their wild enthusiasm only. A few men of learning joined them; among whom was Robert Barclay, the author of an Apology for Quakerism, written in Latin and English. The author was a man of considerable learning, of great industry, and of plausible language. He maintains in the Apology, that Christ died for all men; that all the human family are put into a condition of salvation; that heathens, as well as Christians, may be saved by the improvement of the light of nature; that though man lost, by his fall, all power to obey the divine commands, yet through the sacrifice of Christ Jesus every man has his strength restored to him, so that he can believe and perform all good works. This he calls "the forming of Christ within us," and says, "it is by this inward birth of Christ that man is made righteous, and is so accounted before God: wherefore, to be plain, we are thereby, and not till that be brought forth in us, formally, if we must use that word, justified in the sight of God, because justification is both more properly, and more frequently in scripture taken in its proper signification for making one just, and not reputing one such, and is all one with sanctifica-

tion."* He declares, "that God ever reputed him" (Christ) "a sinner is denied: neither did he ever die that we should be imputed righteous."† "The imputed righteousness of Christ is not to be found in all the Bible."‡ Barclay's Apology was first published in 1675. He has taken extraordinary pains to retain all the reveries of his predecessor George Fox; and at the same time to give them such a colour as might render them less odious, and more similar to the doctrines and creeds of the reformers and reformed churches. He speaks, in the early part of his book, in high strains of encomium on the death and sufferings of Christ, as a propitiation for our sins. He labours, through more than two hundred pages, to conciliate the favour of the reader, by many general expressions of respect for the sacrifice of Christ Jesus, before he ventures to assert that we are justified by our own good works. When he does come to this point, it is in an indirect and uncandid manner. Christ formed within us, he has explained to be the formation of good principles in our hearts, in the heart of every man, who improves the inward light imparted to all. Then he tells us we are justified by Christ formed within us. He allows the reader to draw the conclusion, which will be directly contrary to that of the apostle. The quakers, who embrace the Apology of Barclay, and it is in as much esteem among them as the Bible, must conclude, that a man is justified by the deeds of the law, and that it is of works that every man may boast. It must be evident to the intelligent reader of his doctrines, that he availed himself largely of the writings of Arminius and the Salmurensian divines. His reasonings are substantially the same as theirs, in most points.

The quakers rejected the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, formed for themselves a dress as a distinctive badge of their society, and laid aside all the forms of church government, which had ever been known in the world. Had it not been for these external distinctions, they

* Barc. Apo. Phil. Ed. p. 222. † Ibid. 228. ‡ Ib. p. 229.

would long since have abandoned the mysticism in which they have enveloped Arminianism, and sunk into the methodist, episcopal, or Socinian bodies. The celebrity of William Penn, derived chiefly from his founding the colony of Pennsylvania, who in early life was an ardent and zealous declaimer among the quakers, has been a means of giving more reputation and permanency to this society, than it would otherwise have attained. It has now existed nearly one hundred and seventy years, but it is on the decline. A very plausible apology for quakerism has been lately published, by Clarkson, who pretends that he does not belong to the society. But the days of quakerism are nearly numbered. It is devoutly to be hoped that their simplicity of language, dress, and manners, the only things for which as a denomination they are to be commended, will not die at the expiration of their sect. The episcopal church is not otherwise responsible for the existence of this society than that the persecutions of high churchmen goaded the people on to such madness.

There is another class of mystics, which however has long existed in the very bosom of the episcopal church,—the Swedenburghians, so called from Emanuel Swedenburgh, of Sweden. Swedenburgh was in the early part of his life a distinguished naturalist, especially a mineralogist and metallurgist. He wrote in Latin a treatise on mineralogy, which contains much useful information. Either through the influence of partial derangement, as some, or through fanaticism, as others suppose; or through pious fraud as others think, he pretended to have intercourse with angels. He commenced divine, and wrote very largely. His theological works fill twelve large octavo volumes, written in Latin. He denies the doctrines of divine decrees, of atonement, and of a trinity of persons. He asserts that he was inspired of God to instruct both angels and men; that the general judgment is passed; that he attended it; and that he was commissioned to restore to men the knowledge of the internal sense of the scriptures, which before his time, he says, was entirely lost.

The doctrine of Swedenburgh respecting the trinity, while in some points it resembles the ancient Sabellian heresy, has also some features peculiar to itself. He says there is but one person in the Godhead, which person, until the incarnation of Messiah, acted in one capacity. The incarnation, he explains to be the assumption of human nature, by this one eternal and divine person, "going out," to use his mystical and strange language, "into ultimates." Hence, he is called Father, the human nature is called the Son, and the operation of this "human divine," and "divine human" he calls the Spirit. What he thinks to be precisely the intention of divinity, in this assumption of humanity, it is very difficult to assertain from his writings and those of his disciples; however, they seem to consider it as resulting from the material creation, and the union of intellectual with corporeal substances in human persons. In his system there is nothing like the atonement of the Bible. Faith with him is the same with works, and has no relation to an acceptance of a satisfaction made by Messiah.

The Old Testament history is, he says, a mystical or allegorical history of an ancient church, which may have existed many millions of centuries ago, and the external things there spoken of all correspond to spiritual things represented by them. In this point it resembles the doctrine of Cocceius, who maintained that the history of the Jews, was a type of the New Testament church; with this difference, that Swedenburgh makes it represent a church that existed before Adam, if indeed there was really such a person as Adam, which according to his system seems to be left in doubt. His descriptions of heaven, are derived from Mahomet, or rather Mahomet's and Swedenburgh's heaven is derived from the Epicureans, from the *elysia* of the ancient heathens. He describes in his book on the heavens and the hells, a marriage in heaven, at which the guests was regaled with the richest nectarous wines, and dressed in gorgeous apparel. He represents God in the "form of a man," but not the "shape;" in which he revives the heresy of the Anthropomorphites. The spiritual world, he affirms to

correspond to the material, and that the Son of God is the sun and centre of the spiritual world, as our sun is the centre of the material world,—an idea derived from the Platonic philosophy, and the heathen mythology. Into heaven and the enjoyments of the spiritual world may be, and he contends are, admitted many heathens. What is all this, when stripped of its mystical dress? Perfectly the Arminian creed, except that he pushes it farther, in denying the doctrine of the atonement, and making a sensual heaven. Though perhaps, after all, his mode of explaining the incarnation may amount nearly to the indefinite atonement, or the Salmurensian form of Arminianism.

In his wonderful narrations, he recounts conversations with angels, and adventures in the spiritual world, with as much confidence, as he does the ordinary events of life; and with an extravagance, which makes us exclaim, "risum teneatis, amici?" At first view, we should be disposed to think no men in their senses, would embrace such a system, yet it is certain that many thousands have embraced it, and many of them, in other things intelligent, learned, and amiable. Nor is it wonderful; for the great mysteries of the Christian system he not only pretends to explain, but to make them even visible and tangible. God, he even attempts to exhibit in human form. All his heaven is visible and tangible. Human pride is flattered by being taught to believe that it comprehends fully, all the great mysteries of the bible; and to those who do not possess a taste for spiritual enjoyment, in communion with God, such a heaven as he exhibits must possess all the charms that could fascinate their minds. Owing to these considerations, a thousand absurdities are digested.

The number of disciples which have been made to this system is very considerable. Many of the clergy of the Episcopal establishment, have not only embraced the system, with all its extravagancies, but they preach it, and defend it from the press, and yet continue in the communion of the church. In what way they reconcile it to their consciences, to profess in the most solemn manner from year

to year their belief in the Athanasian creed, and the articles and homilies of the church, all which contain principles diametrically opposite to those which they teach, is not easy to conceive. To swear most solemnly to a belief in the doctrine of the trinity, as contained in the creed of the Episcopal church, and in the doctrine of the atonement, the total depravity of human nature, and other points of the Calvinistic creed, as the Socinians and the Swedenburghians of the church of England do, and yet to write and to preach against them, and for the church to admit of all this prostitution of sacred things, evince a dreadful state of ecclesiastical order. The Rev. Mr. Clows, who has translated and published nearly all the theological works of Baron Swedenburgh, and has himself written largely in defence of them, is in full communion with the church, and the reasons which he pleads in vindication of this course of conduct, are drawn from convenience, ease and policy. Temporal support drawn from the exchequer of the state makes it easy and convenient, and his connection with the church may enable him and his brethren to deceive the unwary, into the fatal errors which they have embraced. Thus conscience is quieted. After all, those who embrace these two great heresies, are generally among the wealthy and fashionable; but few of the poor are led away. The Socinian is too frigid, too far removed from the vital warmth, which animates the page of inspiration, and its gracious and consolatory truths, for the acceptation of the poor. As Swedenburgh teaches that the enjoyments, employments, and situations of men in heaven resemble those which they have in the present world, people oppressed with poverty have no inducement to embrace such a creed. If these systems contain any gospel, it is one not preached to the poor.

The Socinian and Swedenburghian heresies have undoubtedly grown out of Arminianism as the parent stem, and they employ the same arguments which were long ago urged by Pelagius, and by Arminius, in relation to free-will, the moral powers of man, and the divine decrees. All are different corps marshalled in the same cause, and uniting

their forces to demolish the citadel of truth, and banish the atonement of the sacred oracles from the church of God. Thousands, by an easy transition, have gone over to the camp of deism. Indeed the objections urged by deists against the bible, from the time of Celsus, to the days of Thomas Paine, are the same that errorists and heretics urge against the doctrine of the atonement; the degradation of human nature, the merciless character of God, and the injustice of his plans.

We pass over numerous other sects, which have infested the church in Britain, all of which attack, in some manner, the doctrine of the atonement, and multitudes of which swarm in the bosom of the established church.

It is consolatory to the friends of truth, that notwithstanding these errors, the cause of true religion has not been altogether abandoned in the established church of England. There have always been able, learned and pious men, within it, who have raised their voices in vindication of the true Christian system, and in opposition to the errors, which have been overrunning it. Mr. Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Old and New Testaments, is a work which has been highly useful to all Christians into whose hands it has fallen, and all orthodox divines have drawn largely upon it, for aid in their pulpit exhibitions. It possesses a fund of valuable remark and practical deduction from the source of divine truth, which have rendered it savory to all the pious. The views which Mr. Henry entertains of truth are altogether Calvinistic. Like the scriptures on which he comments, he exhibits God as merciful in consistency with justice, and man as a fallen, impotent creature, whose sole dependence for future blessedness must rest upon the unmerited goodness of God, as this has been revealed through the atoning sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In perfect accordance with Henry, are the commentaries of Mr. Burkitt, a highly valuable exposition of the New Testament, which abounds with evangelical and Calvinistic sentiments. These with the work of Mr. Henry, may be considered as an antidote against the Armi-

nian commentaries of Dr. Clarke, whose work, while it contains much curious matter and learned research, is encumbered with no small portion of literary lumber, and pedantry; and is, upon the whole, a special pleading for the tenets of the Arminian school. Whenever an opportunity offers, and even when none is offered, the annotator attacks, with great asperity, the Calvinistic system, of which he evidently possesses but an imperfect knowledge. He also passes over many portions of Scripture, which are richly stored with evangelical truth in a very superficial manner, and scarcely ever unlocks the treasures of gospel truth. The work is better calculated to gratify a vain curiosity, than to feed the soul of a Christian, with the bread of life which cometh down from heaven.

Ridley, Latimer, Jewell, Reynolds and Wilkins, have distinguished themselves, in vindicating ably, many points of the Calvinistic creed, against the attacks of errorists and heretics. The Rev. Dr. John Pye Smith, has published a small work, containing some very judicious remarks on Dr. Priestley's heresies, and detecting many misrepresentations, in his works, especially in his History of Early Opinions.

No one has distinguished himself more as a scholar, and a critic, than the Rev. Dr. Magee, of Dublin College, in a late work on the atonement. We rejoice to hear the voice of Ireland raised in favour of the truth. We might have presented from Dr. Magee's work many specimens of the heresies of Priestley and his coadjutors in the business of tearing down the glorious fabric of divine truth, erected in the eternal councils of Jehovah, and exhibited in the scriptures. He has ably combated Taylor, Geddes, Lindsey, Belsham, Priestley, and the whole host of heretics; he has encountered them single-handed and completely vanquished them. He has also exposed the errors of many of the divines of the church of England who were tenacious friends of the doctrine of atonement, but who have erred on some minor points; such as Warburton, who, in his Divine Legation of Moses, main-

tains that the Jewish sacrifices did not originate from divine appointment, but from heathen superstitions, and were enjoined upon the Jews merely from a compliance with heathenish customs and attachments. The fallacy of this hypothesis is placed in a clear light by Dr. Magee, who has proved incontrovertibly their divine origin. The great object of Dr. Magee's book is to establish the doctrine of substitution—that Christ Jesus was substituted in the room of sinners, and suffered that punishment which sinners would otherwise have endured in their own persons. This grand point he has settled by an extensive review of the Jewish ritual, particularly of the sacrifices under the law, and of the practice of the whole heathen world; as well as by sacred criticism on those portions of both the old and new Testament, in which the atonement is directly taught. He enters the field of criticism, and attacks the adversaries on their own ground, and with the weapons which they profess to wield. This work should have been laid under heavier contribution for this sketch, were it not that we hope every person, who wishes to be thoroughly acquainted with this all important subject, will read the book itself. He will receive the most ample testimony in favour of the truth of the atonement, acquire an extensive knowledge of the heresies in Britain, which relate to it, and discern the present state of the controversy. Still Dr. Magee has not touched the subject of the extent of the atonement. But let it be established, (and he has established it,) that Christ was substituted in the room of sinners and paid to divine justice the debt which they owed, and the conclusion is irresistible that all for whom he was thus substituted, must be saved: otherwise God would be unjust in demanding a double payment for the same debt. He has proved the foundation of the Calvinistic system, to be established on a basis, which cannot be shaken.

There is perhaps no work, since the days of the reformers, that exhibits so much of the patient research and learning of those times as Dr. Magee's. The only point on which he seems not to have very clear ideas relates to the efficacy of

the Jewish sacrifices. He seems to admit that, in themselves, they possessed a certain degree of efficacy, in purging away some crimes committed against the Jewish polity, while the truth is, their whole import, their whole value, consisted in their being types of the great atonement offered up by Jesus on the cross. They were merely "shadows of good things to come, but not the very image of them," as the apostle Paul expresses it.

There are many denominations of dissenters, who embrace the Calvinistic creed, in Scotland, England and Ireland. The Presbyterians of Ireland would deserve to be mentioned, but the synod of Ulster, by which name their supreme judicatory is known, contains so many members, both among the clergy and laity, who have swerved from the truth, that the general assembly of the church of Scotland have passed an act refusing to admit them to communion with them, or to officiate in their congregations, unless they will undergo an examination as to their orthodoxy. The errors of which the Scottish church is afraid relate chiefly to Socinianism. What proportion of them have fallen into this slough of despair for sinners is not known, but it is great; and their ecclesiastical discipline is very much relaxed. Their state in relation to both practice and doctrine, is probably not better than that of the established church. The act of the Scottish judicatory is highly creditable to them, and indicates that their condition, which had greatly deteriorated, is now improving, while that of the Irish Presbyterians is growing worse. Many of the clergy indeed are said to be grossly immoral.

The Anabaptists arose in Germany in the time of the reformation by Luther. They refused subjection to any government, committed the grossest outrages against all the decorums of human society, and were led by illiterate enthusiasts, who excited them to the commission of the greatest crimes. The tenet by which they were distinguished from all other Christians was, that children should not be baptized, and that those who in infancy had received that ordinance should be immersed. When their fury had exhausted

itself they gradually formed themselves into a regular and orderly society, and adopted the independent form of church government. Their creed is generally Calvinistic, and they differed from the other Calvinistic churches, on no other subjects than those of infant baptism and ecclesiastical government. The society in England has become large, intelligent and respectable. One of its most distinguished writers is Dr. Gill, who wrote a commentary on the scriptures. He abounds with sound and truly evangelical views of the doctrines of grace, but he is a loose writer, whose sentences are frequently without end. He wrote a system of theology, which is rather an English compend of Turrettin, than an original work. On the doctrines of grace, he follows Turrettin, except on the doctrine of justification, which, while he maintains that it is solely founded upon the righteousness of Christ, he asserts is from eternity, and that the justification, which takes place in time on the day of believing, is merely a manifestation of that which took place in eternity. His reasoning on this subject, though plausible, is altogether loose and declamatory. He seems not to distinguish between a determination to justify, and the actual performance of the predestinated act. Booth's Reign of Grace is preferable to any of his writings; but still his system forms the text book for nearly all the students of theology in connection with the regular Baptists. There are numerous sects, who agree with the regular Baptists on the subject of infant baptism, but are not in communion with them. The greater part of these are known by the general appellation of irregular Baptists, and are of the Arminian school. Their clergy are generally illiterate and many of their people unenlightened.

The regular Baptists have distinguished themselves by their zealous and laudable efforts for evangelizing the heathen. The great missionary station at Serampore, so well known to the Christian world, and the numerous dependencies upon it, were formed under the direction of the Baptist society. Though it is a subject of no little regret that the children of the heathen converts, made through the liberal and persevering exertions of these people, are not taken

into the visible covenant society of Messiah, yet it is consoling to reflect that the doctrines, which through the instrumentality of those missionaries are taught, are strictly evangelical. The way of salvation, through the doing and dying of the Lord Jesus Christ, forms the sum and substance of that gospel which they preach, and which is now shedding its effulgence, upon the long benighted regions of the East.

Mr. Fuller, a celebrated Baptist preacher, was one of the foremost in this great work. He was an honour to England, and generally Calvinistic in his writings on the plan of salvation, except on the extent of the atonement. In his "Defence," one of his last works, he has in a great measure corrected his former exhibitions even on this subject.

The Secession churches of Scotland and Ireland, have also become powerful societies. They adhere rigidly to the Calvinistic system, as this is exhibited in the Westminster confession of faith. The secession church took its rise in the year 1732. It was formed by some ministers, who seceded from the revolution, or established Presbyterian church in Scotland. After the revolution, ministers were imposed upon the church, by an act of patronage, by which it was put into the power of one person, called the patron, to force a pastor upon a congregation, however disagreeable he might be to them. This privilege was claimed by the crown and surrendered by the general assembly. At an opening of the sessions of that body, the Rev. Ebenezer Erskine preached a sermon, in which he declaimed vehemently against this surrender, as a compromitment of the interests of the church, and gave great offence to the members of the assembly, who attempted to censure him. He refused to submit, and together with his brother Ralph and two other gentlemen, Moncrief and Fisher, who joined him, declined the authority of the assembly, and formed themselves into a distinct society, which was called the Secession church. The circumstance, which gave rise to this schism, rendered the cause of the Seceders very popular: they were orthodox and pious men, and their numbers increased ra-

pidly. They adopted the Westminster confession of faith and the larger and shorter catechisms, compiled by that body, as the standards of their faith, and as terms of ecclesiastical communion. The doctrines which they preached were purely Calvinistic, and the great theme of all their pulpit exhibitions, was the atonement made by Christ Jesus. They published an instrument, which they denominated the act and testimony, in which they bear a very explicit testimony against many corruptions, which prevailed in the church and state; and recognize most explicitly the doctrines of the Westminster confession of faith. Their preachers were generally pious and sound divines, well instructed in evangelical truth, and zealous in promoting it. The Erskines published many volumes of sermons, which abound with excellent matter, though their stile is far from being either eloquent or forcible; and their arrangement is often loose and unhappy. Those discourses, from the piety with which they abound, have been extensively read, have proved savory to all devout people, and have formed an antidote against the Arminian errors among thousands of the laity. The Rev. John Brown, of Haddington, is the most distinguished divine, which this church has produced. He was for many years their professor of divinity, and has published a great number of valuable books, all of which abound with pious and judicious remarks. His body of divinity contains an excellent epitome of the Christian system, and is replete with excellent matter. His Dictionary of the Bible is his most popular work; and it has passed through a great number of editions. Though Mr. Brown was not a man of very brilliant powers, or very profound learning, his industry, discrimination, and orthodoxy, were a means of elevating the character of the Secession church and greatly increasing its numbers.

A member of this church, Mr. M'Crie, has lately published a life of the great Scottish reformer, which evinces much learning, sound judgment, and liberal views. He rescues the character of Knox from the load of obloquy which had been heaped upon it by infidels, heretics, and

lukewarm Christians, who garnish the tombs of the martyrs; and throws a new and copious stream of light upon the reformation in Scotland. His book has deservedly acquired great reputation, for its author, even among the members of the church of England, and he is justly considered one of the first literary men in Britain. His life of Knox and Magee on the atonement, seem to indicate that a revival of sound theology, and solid Christian literature, is about to commence in the British empire. While Magee vindicates the doctrine of the atonement, against the sophistry of heretics, M'Crie illustrates, and defends the characters of those excellent men, who first taught the British nation to purge itself from popish errors, and brought to light, after a long night of darkness, the way of salvation through the satisfaction and mediation of Messiah.

Though the secession has been broken into three sections, by various practical and theoretical questions, yet they all continue sound on the doctrine of the atonement, and perfectly harmonise in their opposition to Arminianism, and all its brood of heresies. They have two large synods in Ireland and in Scotland, and a presbytery consisting of about twelve ministers, forming a separate ecclesiastical body. The Irish synods have been somewhat enfeebled, and their clergy have rendered themselves unpopular by accepting, since the united societies created disturbance, a *bonus* from the government, as a reward for their public prayers, on behalf of the government. This was an act altogether unworthy of faithful ministers of Christ Jesus.

The reformed presbyterians, usually known by the name of Covenanters, are another respectable body of dissenters in Britain. When the king and his government, partly by persecution and partly by seduction, had drawn off the attention of all the clergy of the three kingdoms from the convenanted reformation, there still remained a considerble body of intelligent and respectable Christians, among the laity, who refused to follow their spiritual guides, in an abandonment of the covenants, which they considered

as an oath, binding the whole nation to maintain the truth. They declared that they would not forsake that cause, in which they had seen so many of their brethren ascend the scaffold, and approach the stake. They would not even receive the ordinances of the gospel at the hand of those whom they considered as apostates and as having violated the oath of God. They worshipped in private societies, refusing even to hear the gospel preached by the ministers, whom they esteemed guilty of so criminal a direliction of principle. The societies corresponded with each other, and thus kept up a visible organization, as far as this could be done without the public officers and ordinances of the church. They refused to accede to the revolution settlement, when William and Mary ascended the throne, because the covenants were not recognised, and because they considered the whole establishment a mere production of human policy, without any respect to the glory of the Creator, or to the interests of truth and righteousness.

In 1706, this body of people was joined by the Rev. John M'Millan, a minister who had separated himself from the established church of Scotland, on account of the numerous errors with which it abounded. He was afterwards joined by the Rev. Mr. Nairn, a minister of the Secession church. A presbytery was now constituted, and stiled the Reformed Presbytery, from their adherence to the system of truth and order established at the time of the adoption of the covenants, when, they believed, the reformation had attained to its greatest glory. From the attachment of these people to the covenants, they were called Covenanters. They were also called Mountain men, from the circumstance of many of them having been forced to take refuge in the mountains as a shelter from the rage of their persecutors.

In 1761, they published an instrument, which they styled the Act, Declaration and Testimony, in which they narrate briefly their history, and express a warm attachment to the cause and memory of those martyrs who had laid down their lives for the sake of the truth, and on behalf of the

covenants, to which they profess in the most solemn manner their stedfast attachment. They adopt the Westminster confession of faith, as an exhibition of those truths which form their creed. They at the same time, give a condensed view of the same doctrines, expressed in their own words, and testify against the numerous errors of the ecclesiastical and civil establishments of the nation. They were a devout and intelligent people; but by their lukewarm neighbours, were viewed in the light of bigots.

They and the Secession body differed, in their views respecting civil government only. While the latter testified against the government for not adhering to the covenants, they acknowledged that they were the ordinance of God and entitled to respect and obedience as such. They also held offices under the government, and took an active part in its concerns. The covenanters, on the other hand, maintained, that its apostacy was of such a character as to deprive it of all right to rule, and that it was to be numbered among those "that had given their power to the beast;" "one of the thrones of iniquity, with which God has declared that he will have no fellowship." With relation to the doctrine of the atonement, these two branches of the church perfectly harmonize.

The covenanters have a synod in Ireland and one in Scotland, and their numbers, respectability and influence are rapidly increasing. Their preachers are learned, popular, and eloquent. There is one point, on which they lay great stress and generally deal largely in their pulpit exhibitions,—the headship of Messiah over the nations. They say that in consequence of that humiliation to which he submitted, in order to make an atonement, God the Father has highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue confess; that in his mediatorial character, he governs the nations, and that the nations should subject themselves to his government, and regulate all their civil movements according to those laws, which as Mediator he has revealed in the scriptures. The Christian nation

which will not do so, they maintain is in a state of rebellion against his regal government, and will be overturned "when he cometh out of his place to shake terribly the inhabitants of the earth;" and that therefore they are not entitled to the support of the people of God, as the legal representatives of Messiah upon earth. These are consequences deduced from the atonement, which thousands of Christians admit, but upon which none but the reformed presbyterians lay much emphasis.

A very respectable work on the Trinity has lately been published in Britain, written by a Mr. Kidd. It is replete with curious matter and profound speculation. He attempts to prove the doctrine of the Trinity without the aid of divine revelation. He says that as God cannot impart to his intelligent creatures any power which does not reside in himself, and as he has imparted perception and social powers to all his intelligent creatures, he therefore must have had them himself from all eternity: he must have possessed power to perceive objects exterior to his own person, and social powers; that these powers cannot be supposed to have existed from eternity without ever having been exercised until the creation of this universe; that they must have had a field to exercise themselves upon, commensurate with their extent; and that these powers of God the Father must have been employed in contemplating the person of the Son; which, from the data before laid down, must be infinite in all perfection. Thus he believes, that he proves from reason, at least the existence of two persons; and the third person, the Holy Spirit, he says proceeds from the Father and the Son, as a necessary consequence of the constitution of the two other *hypostases*, or persons, and the exercise of their powers. This is not perhaps doing justice to Mr. Kidd. Indeed it is impossible to do justice to such a work in so short an abstract. These views he attempts to establish from the Holy Scriptures. All orthodox divines have maintained that the Trinity was as necessary and natural as the existence of an eternal God, but none, so far as we know, has ever attempted to demonstrate from rea-

son, this necessity. His work has acquired great celebrity in Britain, and, whatever may be thought of his success in the chief object which he sets before him, he must rank high as a man of great powers and profound speculation. As to the qualities of matter, Deity can and does produce all the effects, that proceed from them: the properties of matter are no more than the results of his energetic operations.

Before we take leave of Europe, we must cast a glance at the Roman catholic church. The ground which that church took at the great council of Trent, which met in the early part of the sixteenth century, was utterly subversive of the atonement. All those who deny the efficacy of indulgences, the absolutions of the priests, and various other means of procuring pardon, are anathematized. But the reformation soon operated a very considerable change for the better in the opinions of catholics. In 1641, Jansenius, archbishop of Ypres, published a book on the doctrine of grace, which professes to contain an explanation of the opinions held by Augustine, on the nature of the atonement. In 1653, pope Innocent III. condemned as extracts from Jansenius the following propositions: 1. "That there are some commands impossible to the saints, because they have not sufficient grace. 2. That grace is irresistible. 3. That a liberty free from restraint, not necessity, is sufficient to constitute merit or demerit. 4. That the Semipelagian heresy consisted in maintaining, that it was impossible to resist or comply with the motions of grace. 5. That Jesus Christ did not die for all men." As far as this is perspicuous, and as far as it goes, it is the same with the doctrine which Calvin was teaching at Geneva, at the very time when the pope condemned the book of Jansenius. Great numbers of the catholic clergy espoused the cause of Jansenius, and embraced the doctrines which he taught. A very great body of them united in stopping a writ of error, which had issued against his book. The laity of the catholic church are more enlightened than they were previously to the reformation.

The prospect, however, for the interests of truth are in

some respects gloomy. The man of sin whose throne crumbled by the late revolutions in Europe, is again exalted by the combined efforts of all the kings of Europe. While heresy and lukewarmness overspread nearly all the greatest protestant churches, the pope is reinstated in his ghostly empire, and the popish religion, under his auspices, and those of all the kings who have given their power to him, again flourishes, and again threatens to cover Europe with a very dark night of superstition. Again the hopes of salvation, in nearly the whole of that quarter of the world, seem to be directing themselves towards those miserable means, which the catholic church presented, before the reformation. England has had a leading hand in the iniquitous elevation of antichrist. After his late reinstatement in his royal splendours, it is said the Prince Regent of England wrote him a letter, in which he says he puts a *carte blanche* into the hand of his holiness, and that he will do whatever he commands in relation to the church in his dominions. If this statement is correct, and there is no reason to doubt it, the Prince Regent, by that act, has formally undone all that was done by Henry VIII. in declaring Great Britain independent of the see of Rome; and has formally subjected, once more, the British empire to the dominion of antichrist. Thus, this once covenanted kingdom has in the most effectual, as well as formal manner, given its power to the beast. Notwithstanding all that is doing in Europe to cherish Bible societies and foster missionary efforts, we have little reason to hope that orthodox principles will flourish, while the present state of things lasts. But God will arise and have mercy upon Zion, for the time which he has set to favour her, has nearly come. He will shake down those thrones of iniquity, and amidst their ruins he will build his church on a permanent foundation.

We now invite the attention of the reader to the new world, in which a vast field opens. The first settlers, who established themselves at Cape Cod in Massachusetts, A. D. 1616, were English Puritans, who understood well the doctrines of grace, and adhered to them, with great firmness.

Though they commenced their settlement in New England twenty-three years before the meeting of the assembly of divines at Westminster, yet they embraced the same doctrines which that venerable assembly embodied in their Confession of Faith and Catechisms. It was indeed their attachment to these principles, that induced them to forsake their native land, and encounter all the difficulties of settling in a strange and distant land, among the savages of the wilderness. Heaven had manifested its goodness, in bringing to light a new world in the west, just before the storm of persecution burst upon the reformers, that an asylum might be afforded them, from the violence of their adversaries. The fathers of New England have been represented by many of their ungrateful sons as a rude, ignorant, bigoted and unenlightened people. No representation, however, could be farther from the truth, nor more injurious to their real character. They did not indeed possess that polish, which has been acquired by more modern society, but they had what was of incomparably more value—great piety, zeal for the truth, clear conceptions of what is truth, and resolution to practise the duties which it enjoins. It has always been customary among the New England divines, to publish sermons which were delivered on stated and important occasions; and from all these that we have been able to see, they were harmonious and united in their attachment to the creed of the Genevan school, as explained and embraced by the British reformers.

In 1648, the Westminster Confession of Faith was approved by the clergy of Massachusetts; and in the year 1680, the Savoy Confession of Faith was adopted by the congregational clergy assembled in Boston and its vicinity, as the expression of their own sentiments. The doctrines of this latter system are the same with those of the Westminster confession, and in most instances expressed in nearly the same words. At its adoption, there does not appear to have been one dissenting voice, either among the clergy or laity. Their form of church government rendered it impossible for the association of clergy, who gave it their

sanction, to impose it upon all the congregations under their charge. They could do no more than recommend it, as all their congregations were associated bodies, independent of each other. It would, nevertheless, at that time have been deemed highly improper for any one of the ministers or of their congregations, to have departed from the system of truth which was embraced and recommended by the general convention. This very system of government, if it may be called a system, opened in some measure a door for the introduction of error, and gave to errorists facilities for introducing their tenets, which did not exist in the presbyterian church, in which all the members are directly amenable to the presbytery for those doctrines which they teach. In the New England churches, the clergy were directly and immediately amenable to their own congregations only; and, as the authority of the association over its members was very slight, a minister might exhibit opinions contrary to the analogy of faith, for a considerable time before any account would be taken of him. Those, however, who were found to be chargeable with heresies, might be cited before a council, and if found guilty, deposed from office. This power has, in some instances, been exercised by some of the northern churches.

For a considerable time after the adoption of the Savoy Confession of Faith, by the ministers of Boston, we have the most ample testimony, that the northern people maintained stedfastly the principles which are contained in that excellent compend.

The churches in Connecticut had become very numerous about the beginning of the last century, but the laxness of discipline, the irregularity of the life of many members of the church, and the want of an acknowledged general standard of doctrine, began to excite the fears of many enlightened men. At Gilford a measure originated, intended to produce a better state of things. The civil government of the colony considered themselves as entitled, by their office, to watch over the welfare of their citizens in relation to their religious interests; and in 1703, they invited a convention of

the clergy to assemble, and devise measures for promoting the welfare of the church. This assembly of the Connecticut clergy met at Saybrook on the 13th of May, 1708; and the result of their deliberations was the unanimous adoption of the Savoy Confession of Faith, as their standard of doctrine. They approve of the whole of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and speak of it in the very highest terms of commendation. In the Savoy confession they made a few slight alterations, rather of a verbal nature; but no change was made in the doctrine of divine decrees, the total depravity of human nature, and the definite satisfaction made by Messiah for the elect.

In an act which they passed on the subject of doctrine, they say:—"As to what appertains to soundness of judgment, in matters of faith, we deem it sufficient, that a church acknowledge the scriptures to be the word of God, the perfect and only rule of faith and practice, and own the doctrinal part of the confession commonly called the articles of the church of England, or the confession, or catechism, larger, or shorter, compiled by the assembly at Westminster, or the confession agreed upon at Savoy, to be agreeable to said rule." Here we have the whole colony of Connecticut, both in its civil and ecclesiastical capacities, expressing its approbation of the doctrines of the Genevan school. Any person who should deny the truth and divine origin of the Holy Scriptures, or the doctrine of the Trinity, has always in Connecticut been incapacitated for holding civil offices; and that state has always adopted the principle, that the civil transactions of a nation should be rendered subservient to the great interests of man, and that the sacred scriptures are the rule by which men should regulate all their civil affairs. To the interference of the civil power, we are in this instance indebted for so excellent an expression of orthodoxy. This measure was a great means of harmonizing the affections of the Connecticut clergy, in promoting the interests of religion; and to it, doubtless, we are in part to attribute the excellent state of morals, and education, for which this state is unrivalled by any other section of the

union. The clergy were drawn together into a closer union, acquired more confidence in each other, and became more watchful in guarding their churches and associations against the inroads of error. When the people of Connecticut established grammar schools, or gave their sons a liberal education, it was chiefly with a view that the churches should be supplied with enlightened and learned ministers, who might make known to perishing sinners the way of salvation, through the obedience, death, and intercession of Messiah; and the supply of clergy always kept pace with their increasing population.

In the adoption of the Westminster and Savoy Confessions of Faith, the churches in Connecticut followed Massachusetts, the parent from which she was descended; and the state of orthodoxy was probably about the same then, in that colony, that it had been fifty years before in the parent state; in which it began to decline early in the last century. Many great and good men exerted themselves with faithfulness and zeal to preserve the ancient opinions and habits free from corruption. Among the most distinguished of these was the Mather family. The Rev. Richard Mather was the first of this stock, that emigrated to New England, to which he was driven by persecution. He arrived in Boston in 1635, and was the founder of a family of great respectability, many of whom have been ministers of the gospel eminent for their orthodoxy, piety, and influence in the political and ecclesiastical affairs of Massachusetts. His son, Increase Mather, was educated in Harvard college, where he graduated in 1656, and was ordained to the pastoral charge of a congregation, in 1659. Two years after his ordination he was invited to take charge of the college as its principal, but he preferred the situation in which he was placed, to the honourable station offered him. He did, indeed, at first accept it, and preside at one commencement, but immediately after resigned, in compliance with his own wishes, and those of his congregation, who were warmly attached to him, and would not consent to part with him. In 1662, a vacancy happening in that office, he was again

solicited, as the most learned and pious man in New England, to accept the presidency. His congregation continued their attachment to him, and he would not do violence to their feelings. But in consideration of his great merit, the trustees permitted him to officiate in his congregation once every sabbath. With this privilege he accepted the presidency, and continued to perform the duties of his office, with great reputation to himself, and honour to the college, until the year 1701, a period of sixteen years; when his age incapacitated him for the longer discharge of its literary functions. He wrote and published many books, most of which, that have fallen into our hands, abound with piety and good sense. The style, indeed, is destitute of polish and elegance, but the abundance of matter more than compensates for this defect.

The Baptist society in his day were numerous and increasing; they attacked both from the pulpit and the press, the baptism of infants. Dr. Mather published several sermons on this controversy; and all his arguments evince not only the soundness of his views in relation to the subject in controversy, but of the doctrines of grace generally. In this controversy, both he and his opponent appeal to the opinions of the first settlers in Massachusetts, and to Dr. Owen, all of whom, as to their opinions in relation to the covenant of works, to the covenant of grace, to the doctrines of the Christian system, and the nature of the church, each party mentions with high respect. From this fact we discover, if any testimony in addition to their writings were deemed necessary, that, however the baptists and the congregationalists of that time might disagree on the subject of infant baptism, they harmonized entirely on the doctrine of the atonement, and all the other fundamental doctrines of the system of redemption, as these are taught by Dr. Owen, and other writers of the Calvinistic order. They mutually deprecate the introduction of the Arminian errors into the New England churches, of which they express much fear from the aspect of the church and the state of public opinion.

On the subject of Adam's representing his posterity in the covenant of works, Dr. Mather thus expresses himself incidentally:—" If mankind confederated actually in Adam, their public person, when they did so much as in their proper persons, then may children actually existing in their proper persons, actually confederate in their public person. But mankind, not yet existing in their proper persons, confederated in Adam their public person." He then quotes from Thomas Vedelius de Deo, the following passage: " The sin of Adam is not another's, but our own. Adam's sin was in a manner peculiar to itself voluntary on our part, because as we were in Adam, so in him we willed. The will of Adam was the will of the whole mass." Though the mode in which Thomas expresses himself is obscure, yet it is plain that both he and Dr. Mather held the doctrine of Adam's representation of his posterity, and of all mankind's sinning in him. He also quotes with approbation Mr. Norton, to the same effect. The work from which the above extract is taken was published in 1775.

Cotton Mather, the son of Increase Mather, was a much more voluminous writer than his father. His writings are not free from some traits of superstition, but they are orthodox on the doctrines of the atonement, and all other capital articles of the Christian faith. His Magnalia, or History of New England, though evidently written with great haste, and though the facts are neither selected with judgment nor well arranged, is a treasure of historical fact, upon which all the succeeding historians of New England make large draughts. His Biblia Americana, a commentary on the Bible, has never been published; it is now in manuscript in the collection of the Massachusetts Historical Society. He published a great number of smaller works, many of which are highly valuable, and read with great interest by the common people, and by the best of the clergy of the northern states. The influence which this divine had over the minds of the people of New England was extraordinary, and can no otherwise be accounted for than by supposing that he

was a man of great worth. While the Mather family possessed this influence over the public mind, the vital spirit of Christianity, the faith of the Christian in the atoning sacrifice of Christ Jesus, animated the church in Massachusetts. The clergy who were associated with them were generally of the same stamp with themselves. All that is excellent in the character of the New England people, and there is much, may be traced to these old and godly puritans. All admit that these were times of great piety; and that though there were many imperfections, yet it would be difficult to find in the history of human society more virtue than then existed in the northern colonies.

The clergy were well indoctrinated, and willing to be instructed by the great orthodox divines of the Christian church, who had preceded them, especially by those of the reformation. They were willing to travel in the plain path of truth, without bewildering themselves in the mazes of false philosophy, and idle speculation. They, above all, were not averse to submit their opinions to the authority of God speaking in the scriptures, though there were many truths above the comprehension of human reason; such as the existence of three persons in the Godhead of one undivided essence, the incarnation of Messiah, and the atonement which he offered to eternal justice for the redemption of sinners. Such was the character of the clergy, who were at that time educated in Harvard college; which for more than a century was a great blessing to the New England churches.

This seminary was founded in 1638, and received its first endowment from Mr. John Harvard, a minister of the gospel, who resided in Charlestown. It was chartered by the crown of England in 1650. At first, it was chiefly under the direction of the puritan clergy; and those ministers who were educated in it, generally taught the Calvinistic doctrines only. Among the distinguished men who were educated in it, was the Rev. Dr. Benjamin Coleman, of whom we have a biography by Mr. Turell; a book which though not well written, throws considerable light upon the state of

religion, and religious opinions, in New-England, during the early part of the last century.

A professorship of divinity was founded in Harvard college, by a donation from Mr. Thomas Hollis, in honour of whom it has been styled the Hollis professorship. Mr. Hollis, aided by Dr. Coleman, was extremely minute in forming regulations, by which no one except an orthodox divine, one entirely of the Calvinistic creed, should be admitted to fill the divinity chair. Those intelligent Christians, no doubt, even at that early date, saw symptoms of decline in the churches of New-England, which induced them to place many guards around the important chair, which they were erecting in the college. For as early as 1732, we find the errors of Arminius were finding their way into Yale college, a sister institution. In a letter to Mr. Adams, of New-London, in Connecticut, dated December 2d, of that year, Dr. Coleman thus expresses himself:—"Give me leave to add one word more concerning the bruit of the prevalence of Arminianism in the college," (of New-Haven). "I am told that you were yourself in much apprehensions, and fears on that head, that you enquired earnestly of your son concerning it; and that the deceased, aged Mr. Woodbridge, of Hartford, a little before his death, was under great concern on that account. It would be acceptable to some friends here, if you would freely write upon that head; more especially if you can vindicate the college from the aspersion. They hope and believe the reverend trustees and rector, have made a faithful enquiry into that matter." Here we discover, that at least a report had spread abroad, that Arminian principles had found their way into the fountains of learning in New-England, and that Dr. Coleman, whose reputation was very high, and who maintained the principles then generally prevalent among the New-England clergy, and other pious men of distinction, considered the report one of a very formidable character, and would have thought it a most alarming evil, had it been true, as no doubt, it was.

The particular tenet of the Arminian school in this ancient seminary is not mentioned; but as the doctrine of ge-

neral atonement not long after began to prevail among the New-England clergy, it is probable this was the first Arminian principle which was taught in New-England. This is still rendered more probable, as about forty years before this time, a very large body of the reformed clergy of France, after the revocation of the edict of Nantz, had taken refuge in London, and they were nearly all advocates of some of the Salmurensian errors, especially that which respects indefinite atonement. Between the London divines, many of whom embraced the Salmurensian errors, and the New-England ministers, there was a very intimate connexion. Dr. Coleman, when in London, was very intimate with the most distinguished of the dissenting preachers of that city. A correspondence had been kept up between them before the time of Dr. Coleman, and the works of the London divines were circulated and read in Massachussetts, Connecticut, and the other northern states. The manner in which Dr. Coleman writes to his friend in relation to the Arminianism of the college, shews that whatever the principle was which was said to be embraced in the college, he had not adopted it.

While those errors were stealing into New-England, the church in the middle states did not continue altogether pure. Of the state of theological opinions in the south at that time, little is known. A majority of the leading men of the colony of Virginia were Episcopalians, who procured an establishment of their creed; and the government compelled all other denominations to contribute towards the support of their clergy. The episcopal clergy of Virginia, scarcely published any thing either on theology, or any other subject. The state of learning was very low in that colony. The greater part of their clergy were from the English universities, and these were far from being very learned; nor were they remarkable for their faithfulness in performing ministerial duties, or for the holiness of their lives. They, like their brethren in England, generally embraced the Arminian system; which, no doubt was the cause of the deficiency in vital godliness, with which they are chargeable. There were comparatively, few presby-

terians in Virginia, for many years after its first settlement.

Maryland was colonized by George Calvert, baron of Baltimore, a Roman Catholic; and the principal part of the emigrants, who followed the destinies of that nobleman, into the new world, were of the same faith with himself. Their doctrines and their policy, long predominated in the colony.

William Penn, the founder of the colony of Pennsylvania, was, in the earlier part of his life, an enthusiastic disciple of George Fox, the father of the Quaker society; and published some small tracts of his own composition, in defence of the peculiar doctrines of Barclay, and the practices of the society. After he became a politician, it is altogether doubtful, whether he was a Quaker, a Roman Catholic, or a mere political manœuverer, without any real regard for any religion. But whatever he may have been in reality, the first settlers of his colony were principally Quakers, and he found it convenient, to maintain an external attachment to the society, and to express great regard for their peculiarities. The founders of the colony were, of course, not believers in the atonement. The chief books which they brought over with them, were Barclay's Apology, and the Tracts of Penn. To these were confined nearly all their reading, and in these was to be found their whole creed. Very little or rather no efforts were made at the settlement of the colony to encourage literature. Penn, himself, was a very illiterate man, as his education was broken off when his father disowned him for joining the Quaker society. Salvation by works, was the only hope of these deluded people.

They did not long retain the undisturbed possession of the government of the colony. Its founder had held out liberal terms, to people of all denominations of Christians, and of all countries, who should settle in Pennsylvania. Thousands embraced the offers which he made, and soon the Scotch, Irish, and German presbyterians, and German Lutherans, became numerous and powerful. English dissenters of various denominations, and episcopalians also, settled un-

der the government of Penn. All these united together, at first, to oppose the regime of the Quakers, and afterwards wrested it out of their hands. Though the Germans were numerous, the Irish presbyterians were the most powerful of all the parties which opposed the Quaker system.

In New-York there was a considerable number of Scotch, and some Irish presbyterians. The clergy of the presbyterian churches in the middle colonies, retained the principles which their fathers in Britain held, and were attached to the same form of church government; but were at first without any kind of union, not having been authorized, by the judicatories in Britain, to form themselves into a Presbytery, or Synod. They, however, in time, took up the affair, and constituted an ecclesiastical judicatory, styled the Synod of New-York and Philadelphia. This was modelled upon the Genevan plan, to which they had been accustomed in Britain. The condition of the church in America, the want of unity and co-operation among the ministers from the time of their emigration to that in which this Synod was formed, and the predisposition of some to Congregationalism, rendered it impossible to impart so vigorous a tone to this body as would have been desirable. The qualifications for ministerial communion, were not so accurately defined as they had been in the presbyterian churches in Europe. The Westminster Confession, however, was adopted; and all who were admitted to membership, were required to profess their belief in all its doctrines, except those which related to the power of the civil magistrate about religious matters. Though the texture of this fabric was not of remarkable firmness, and though many of the clergy were superficial in their literary attainments, yet they were generally pious; and we have no ground to think that any of them were unsound in the doctrines of the gospel. Their profession of adherence to the Westminster Confession of Faith, was no doubt sincere, and the doctrines which they taught agreeable to the truths which it contains. The opportunities of education which the youth destined for the ministry possessed, were

very slender; their study of theology not systematic, and mostly superficial.

The numbers of this body increased rapidly, both from emigration and natural increase; and the want of energy in the original constitution, became more visible as it developed itself, covered a greater extent of country, and embraced a greater number of congregations.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, was thrown into a violent state of agitation, by one of those events, which is usually known in modern times, by the name of a revival of religion. It was effected through the instrumentality of that very extraordinary man, the Rev. George Whitefield. This gentleman, belonged originally to the episcopal church of England. He possessed warm passions and great zeal for practical religion. The lukewarmness which prevailed in the establishment, was not calculated for a man of his warm feelings and ardent piety. He declaimed, with vehemence, against the vices of the time and the want of practical piety among his brethren; and rendered himself extremely obnoxious to the dignitaries of the church. But he set them all at defiance, and threw himself upon the populace, to whom his addresses were very acceptable. He embraced the principal points of the Calvinistic creed, but doctrinal points were not the subjects upon which he dealt in his exhibitions from the pulpit. The condition of man while in a state of nature, exposed to the wrath of heaven, the blessed estate of the righteous, the glories of heaven, and the horrors of the damned, he described in the most vivid manner, and aroused the fears, and awakened the hopes of his auditors by a torrent of the most irresistible eloquence. No preacher, perhaps, ever addressed larger audiences, whose passions he seemed to have entirely under his control. The chief place in Britain, in which his eloquence produced to the full extent the effects at which it aimed, was in Cambuslang, in Scotland. The passions of those who heard him were not only roused, and his vast audiences caused to burst into a flood of tears; but multitudes were heard to cry aloud for mercy, while others were

writhing under the most alarming bodily convulsions. The work spread in various directions and attracted general notice. He was introduced to the fathers and founders of the Secession church, the Erskines, who were at first very favourably disposed towards him; but upon a more intimate acquaintance, were led to consider him in the light of an enthusiast, without any fixed system of principles, or regularity of plan, and willing to accommodate himself to almost any denomination of Christians, whatever their principles, provided they maintained what he considered the fundamental points of the Christian system. They refused to have any farther ecclesiastical connection with him, or to give him their countenance, as a minister of the gospel.

He set sail for America, animated no doubt with the most honest desire to promote the interests of true religion, and to be instrumental in saving the souls of sinners. He landed at Charleston in 1740, and was soon after invited to Boston. His fame had reached that place before him, and vast audiences assembled at all those places, in which it was known that he would preach. The effects of his preaching were of the same nature precisely in America, as in Britain. Loud cries and bodily agitations were almost every where produced under his ministrations. Many went to hear him either with a view to mock, or to gratify their curiosity, in hearing so celebrated an orator. The clergy and the people in America were divided in their opinions respecting him, as much as in England and Scotland. From New-England, he visited New-York and Pennsylvania. The ministers of the Synod of New-York and Philadelphia, all admitted him into their pulpits; many of them hailed him on his arrival as they would a messenger immediately from heaven, and copied as far as possible, his pathetic mode of preaching. Others thought that such forcible appeals to the passions, without paying sufficient attention to the enlightening of the understanding, were not calculated to produce any lasting salutary effect. They admitted, that Mr. Whitefield might be, and no doubt was, instrumental in the conversion of numerous sinners; that he was pious and honest in his inten-

tions; but they feared that the storm of passion which was raised, would lay waste the order of the church, and in the end, produce more evil than good. The controversy ran high, and much ill nature was mingled with it. Those who followed Whitefield, were called "*New Light*," and "*New Side*," while his opposers were denominated "*Old Light*," and "*Old Side*" men, names borrowed from Scotland. The dispute was not merely about the manner of preaching, it also embraced discussions, on some very important doctrinal topics. Those who adopted the vehement manner of declaiming from the pulpit, found themselves, as they thought, too much limited in their exhortations to duty, while they admitted that the people had no power of themselves to believe, repent, and perform works of righteousness, and were led to assert and maintain, that man has power to perform all the duties which God enjoins upon him, provided he but wills to perform it. Their opponents said, nothing was gained by this distinction; for as man could not will without the assistance of the spirit of God, his incompetency was, upon the whole, the same in both cases. They also said, that to represent man as possessing such powers, was inconsistent with the scriptural account of his native inability, which it makes total; and that this was the opening of a door by which all the Arminian errors would find their way into the church. All these solid arguments were urged in vain: when the sensibilities of the mind are awakened into extraordinary action, the voice of reason, however powerful, is not heard. The new doctrine was drunk in greedily, by many of the ministers and people. It ended in a schism; and the Whitefieldians formed a new presbytery, known by the name of the New-Brunswick presbytery. Many of the ministers and people in Philadelphia, and many in Delaware, belonging to the New-Castle presbytery, embraced the doctrine of natural ability, and moral inability, as taught by the New Lights. The members of the New-Brunswick presbytery, and their adherents, refused to consider their former brethren as ministers of Christ Jesus; or to use the language of that time, they "*unchurched them.*"

This revival, though it was undoubtedly the means of converting many sinners, was through the instrumentality of Satan and the corruptions of the human heart, the cause of introducing into this church evils of which it has never yet been able to purge itself. It left the body crippled, and bleeding with many wounds, which are hardly yet perfectly healed. The Rev. Dr. Ewing, of Market-street church, well known as the principal of the University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Allison; Mr. Steel, of Carlisle; Mr. Elder, of Dauphin county; Mr. Simonton, of the Great-Valley; Dr. Latta and Mr. Willson, were of the Old Light school. The Rev. Messrs. Tennant, Samuel and John Blair, Roan, Foster, Carmichael and Strain, were of the New Light school. The character of many of both parties is well known, and their memory honoured by all good people who knew them. The New Lights, as well as their brethren from whom they separated, were firmly attached to the doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith, except on the subjects which have been mentioned. From the whole of these events we are perhaps warranted in drawing the general conclusion, that those extraordinary excitements, which throw the passions into a violent and ungovernable state of agitation, together with the good effected through grace, usually bring along consequences unfriendly to the best interests of the church.

Between the Presbyterian church in the middle states and the congregational churches in the north, there was not at the time of which we now speak, much connection. This did not proceed from a want of harmony on doctrinal points, for they all embraced the same creed, but from local situation, from the difference in their form of church government, and from their living under distinct colonial governments, not always very harmonious in their political operations. Though the intimacy of connection was not great, there was no hostility, but on the contrary, as far as they knew each other, they were friendly. Mr. Whitefield was the occasion of a similar division in Connecticut. Of the "Old Lights," President Clap, and the Rev. Jedidiah

Mills, (the maternal great-grandsire of the Rev. E. S. Ely,) whom nevertheless Mr. Whitefield has mentioned in his Journal with affection, were the most distinguished.

The revival which he was the means of producing in New England, was promoted by the Rev. Jonathan Edwards, Dr. Bellamy and others, by the same kind of pulpit exhibitions, which we have described in the middle states, except that they partook more of the didactic character. Mr. Edwards was a peculiarly intellectual man. Except a sermon, which he published during the revival in his congregation, nearly all his writings are quite devoid both of imagination and passion. He was a profound reasoner, a very acute metaphysician, who wrote and published many volumes, which have procured for him great celebrity as a scholar and a divine. His defence of the doctrine of the decrees, of original sin, and various other important points of the Calvinistic creed, connected with the atonement, is ample and irresistible. Yet at the time of the revival in his congregation, he became a very passionate speaker, and to such a degree were the feelings of his auditors roused that violent bodily agitations were produced. So sanguine were the hopes of this excellent and celebrated man, as to the consequences that were to result from this revival of religion, and from the state of the world, that he believed the millennial glory of the church was speedily to burst forth upon a benighted world. He even published a small essay to prove that the witnesses were slain, that he might remove one of the greatest obstacles to the realization of those elevated expectations, which he had taught his people to form, and which are expressed in his sermon on the revival. Alas! how were all these hopes frustrated. He soon found that he had been too sanguine; for like the revival at Cambuslang, and that in Pennsylvania, the excitement did not last long. He now perceived that there might arise some misconceptions relative to the exercise of the affections in religion, from the course which he had taken, especially from the sermon which has been mentioned; and when the fervour of his mind subsided, he addressed himself to the writing of a

book on the affections. It is one of his most valuable publications; a work with which every Christian should be acquainted. A difficult, and important subject is discussed with great perspicuity and depth of reasoning.

The reputation which Mr. Edwards acquired during this revival, by his works which grew out of it, and by his profound erudition, wonderful industry, and great fertility of mind, gave him a very extensive influence, not only in the New England, but also in all the Presbyterian churches in America. Hence it is that by some incorrect opinions which are contained in his works, and by strained deductions from what was naturally harmless, the growth of some of the most formidable errors has been greatly accelerated, and evils have been introduced which will not be speedily removed.

A full enumeration of the causes which either prepared the way for the introduction, or immediately introduced, the evils which followed this revival, would occupy more room than can be here devoted to the subject. A few of them shall be exhibited in a concentrated view.

The first that deserves notice, is the metaphysical and speculative character of the puritans, both in England and America. Though many of the puritanical divines are luminous and correct in all their metaphysical discussions, such as the profound Dr. Owen, yet there was among them an extravagant attachment to subtle distinctions, and too great a desire to explain every thing, in such a manner as to render it perfectly within the comprehension of human reason. This did little harm, when confined to subjects of minor importance, but applied to the great mysteries of the Trinity, the atonement, and the incarnation, it could not fail to do mischief. For this propensity the New England Puritans were more remarkable than their English ancestors, as appears from all their theological, moral, and historical works. Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding was early introduced into the northern seminaries as a text book, and made an essential part of a liberal education. From the study of this book men of distinguished mind have always

derived great improvement; while the multitude, who think superficially, are incapable both of detecting the fallacy of some of his reasonings and of comprehending his distinctions, acquire a taste for his subtle speculations, and adopt his erroneous first principles as indisputable. Locke too was an Arminian: he considers the human mind in infancy as a pure sheet equally susceptible of any impressions, whether good or bad. Hence there is no place according to his system, for the doctrine of original sin. Those students who were taught to venerate him, would necessarily imbibe some Arminian tenets, and the tendency of the puritan character to subtle ratiocination would be strengthened.

The writers on ethics, by discussing the subject as entirely distinct from the precepts revealed in the scriptures, and speaking in very general and loose terms about the reward of virtue, representing virtue as leading necessarily to happiness, and pressing it without any allusion to the Christian system, especially to the gracious work of the Spirit of God, upon the human heart, give countenance to the creed of the Arminian school. Some of them also give mistaken, or at least dangerous views of the system of the Universe. Hutchinson, in his Moral Philosophy, (p. 68.) says—"All the variety of evil we behold, is no more or greater than what is necessary to the perfection of the universe." On the subject of disinterested benevolence he says, (p. 64.) "From our natural sense and approbation of moral excellence, wherever it is discovered, there must arise a disinterested love and veneration, detached from all considerations of our own interest." About the middle of the last century, it became fashionable to talk of the good of the whole as the rule of human actions, and thus was revived one of the dogmas of Aristotle. From Europe those opinions were introduced into the New World. Two systems, both apparently and really adverse, were espoused, about the same time, in New England; but when found in the way of detached sentences in the works of metaphysicians and moralists, the discrepancy was not so visible as now, since they have become fully matured. One was the Armi-

nian tenets of Locke; the other, that the whole system of the universe is all arranged by God so that a reference is always had to the good of the whole, and that as a practical result of this doctrine, every man should search for what will best promote the good of the whole, and make it without any regard to himself the rule of his own conduct. It was in Harvard University and Yale College that Arminianism first made its appearance among the congregationalists. Whether the other opinion was maintained there at the same time, we have not been able to ascertain.

The Salmurensian controversy was also well known in New England, and from the similarity, or rather from the identity of many of the errors which soon after the revival in question made their appearance in the north, there is not the least room left for doubt, that a considerable number of divines had adopted the opinions of Amyraut. One of his opinions, not before mentioned was, that God is the author of sin.

A declension of vital piety, for some time before the revival, had been very conspicuous in the New England churches. In the invitation which the ministers of Boston sent to Mr. Whitefield, while in Charleston, they complain in very strong terms of the want of practical piety, and of a general declension of the power and life of godliness in their congregations*. This declension appears to have commenced about the time that the *bruit* of Arminianism spread abroad, which was eight years before the invitation to Whitefield†. Here the same deleterious effects were produced by Arminianism, or by Amyraldism, which it has elsewhere produced. Corruption in doctrine generally precedes a decay of practical religion; and the latter accelerates the growth of the former.

About the time that Yale College was first suspected of favouring Arminianism, the character of Dr. Isaac Watts became known in Boston, and the northern churches. This

* Backus's History of New England.
† Life of Dr. Coleman, p. 53.

gentleman was born at Southampton in Britain, 1764, and had acquired considerable reputation as a poet and a metaphysician. He had published his Imitation of the Psalms of David, designed for the purposes of devotion, and they had been introduced into several churches in Britain. Dr. Coleman, when in England, formed an intimate acquaintance with him, and after his return to America, corresponded with him. Until that time the old version of the psalms of David had been used almost exclusively in the congregational churches of New England. Dr. Coleman, considered the Bible as the best and only manual. He proposed to introduce into his congregation some of the psalms and verses of Watts' Imitation, and that where Watts had omitted whole psalms they should be supplied, for he says,—"I judge it best for us to have the whole book of Psalms in its order as we now have it,"* though he was not averse to the use of other portions of scripture when versified for that purpose.

In the introduction of Watts' Imitation he was very cautious, and selected with great care those portions of it which he considered as translations of the original. As to the use of human compositions the doctor says:—"My opinion is, that in the book of psalms and in several other parts of holy scripture, there is full provision made for the collection of a body of psalmody, for the use of the church through all ages, in the public and private worship of God." Hence it appears that Dr. Coleman, would not have introduced the whole of scripture when versified, into divine worship, but only the poetic portions of it, and that he would have excluded entirely all human compositions. He wished a smoother version than the old, "though," as his biographer says, "he was far from despising and speaking reproachfully of it as some have." With all this caution Dr. Coleman was setting open the floodgates of error.

With the psalms of Dr. Watts, his other writings were introduced into New England. Men who had been accustomed to sing only divinely inspired songs, when they began to sing those of Watts, would naturally attach something

* Life of Dr. Coleman, p. 177.

like the notion of inspiration to his character, as thousands have since done, who assert that he was as much inspired as David. Hence they would be ready to embrace any opinion which they found in his writings. Dr. Watts was a Sabellian, and an Arian. He maintained that there was but one person in the Godhead, who was represented as acting in the capacities of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that the human soul of Christ existed before all worlds and created them. Mr. Jonathan Edwards viewed his scheme in this light. "According to what seems to be Dr. Watts' scheme the Son of God is no distinct person from the Father. So far as he is a divine person, he is the same with the Father. So that in the covenant of redemption, the Father covenants with himself, and he takes satisfaction of himself.—But how does this confound our minds instead of helping our ideas!"* Such is the light in which Mr. Edwards viewed Watts' opinions. Watts, in his imitation of the second psalm, leaves out the words, "thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." It is true, that by others it has been introduced; but as Watts left it out we perceive how he thought. Perhaps no one cause was more efficient in opening the way for the northern heresies, which shall soon be exhibited, than the influence of Dr. Watts' name.

Men who have the best acquaintance with President Edwards know, that he maintained most firmly, the doctrine of divine decrees, the imputation of Adam's sin, the total depravity of human nature, the substitution of Christ Jesus in the room of the elect, a definite atonement, and the imputation of Christ's righteousness to sinners for their justication. To establish these doctrines, is the main object of nearly all his works. But on some of these points, as well as others, he uses expressions, which some have wrested from their signification. His mind was remarkably acute and discriminating; and he permitted himself to attempt explanations of things which the scriptures, for wise reasons surely, leave unexplained; and here he rather bewilders himself and his readers. How can God decree, or foresee all things, and yet the creature be a free agent, and

* Edwards's Essays.

accountable? Such questions he attempts to answer, forgetting that some intermediate truth may be necessary to explain the seeming inconsistency. As had any of the ancients been told that there are antipodes, and yet that both stand erect, they, believing the earth to be an extended plain, would have considered the proposition as involving a contradiction. But the sphericity of the earth and the doctrine of gravitation solve the phenomenon and render all perspicuous. So those difficulties in the Christian system may be, and no doubt will hereafter be explained, by truths whose revelation is reserved for heaven. If we have such difficulties in the natural world, why should we not in the moral? It is here that he used the rather unguarded expressions which follow:—"He should say, that God has decreed every action of men—and just so sinful as they are."* He maintains that God arranges all the motives by which we are moved to act, that we necessarily act from motives; but that the mind possesses an innate activity, and that its operations proceed from itself. His son Dr. Jonathan Edwards, who wrote against Chauncy, does not admit this distinction, and says that God is the efficient cause of all our actions, and hence is the author of sin. The father was however, far from making God the author of sin, and charges the sinfulness of the action wholly upon the sinner. He wrote a treatise on the foundation of virtue, which he maintains to be benevolence to being in general, and illustrates his position and defends it with his accustomed ingenuity. From this afterwards originated the doctrine of disinterested benevolence towards God, and the opinion that men should be willing to be damned for the glory of God.

In his History of Redemption, a most valuable work, he maintains that Christ owed obedience to the law for himself, besides that which he owed as mediator. On this hypothesis, we shall afterwards see that the error of Piscator respecting the active obedience of Christ was revived in the United Sates.

* Sect. 8th. of his Miscellaneous Observations.

The divine, who next to President Edwards took the most conspicuous part in this revival, was Dr. Bellamy, and contributed his part towards the northern errors. This gentleman was born at Cheshire, in the county of New-Haven, 1719, and was educated at Yale college, the seminary in which nearly all the Connecticut clergy have gone through their studies preparatory to the ministry, and which from its foundation has been a highly respectable seminary. In 1740, he was settled in Woodbury. As soon as the revival commenced, he itinerated as a preacher, every where fanning the flame kindled by Whitefield. He was a very pious and industrious man, but possessed less learning and acuteness than Edwards. In a system of theology which he afterwards published, we find almost the same views, which were taught by Cameron and Amyraut at Saumur. His chief errors were relative to the extent of the atonement, the steps preparatory to pardon, which he maintains is preceded by repentance, and in relation to our natural powers. On the first of these points he says:*—"God therefore through Jesus Christ stands ready to pardon the whole world; there is nothing in the way." Again, "If Christ died only for the elect, that is, to the intent that they only upon believing, might consistently with the divine honour he received to favour, then God could not consistently with his justice, save any besides, if they should believe." Much more might be quoted to the same purpose. He denied the doctrine of substitution.

On the subject of our natural and moral powers his conceptions were indistinct, partly perhaps from unwillingness to abandon the doctrines in which he had been educated, and partly from a partial adoption of the "new light" creed of Whitefield. He says, "whether we are beings of as large natural powers as we should have been had we never apostatized from God, or not, yet this is plain, we are no where in scripture blamed for having no larger natural powers." Others improved upon this system. They soon began to teach that the atonement was made without any relation to

* Vol. I. p. 381, of his works, p. 383.

any individual; and merely to satisfy the general justice of God, so that all might be saved, or none, according as they should believe; yet they maintained that faith is the gift of God, in consequence of eternal election. On the subject of man's natural powers they said, that he was fully able to perform every thing commanded of God, but yet that he could not *will* without divine aid; as if *volition* were not required.

Such opinions as these introduced during a state of great excitement in the public mind, when Christians were not in a state to reason, spread with rapidity.

While incorrect views of the philosophy of the human mind, of the foundation of virtue; and while the Arminian errors, from various sources, were spreading themselves through the churches to the north, the condition of the church in the middle states was rather improving. The divisions, which had been produced by Whitefield's revival, were healed; the majority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church was orthodox, on the doctrines of grace; and many of them were opposed to that *latitudinarianism*, which treats with great courtesy all who profess to be Christians, whatever their tenets may be. This was tested by the arrival of Dr. Joseph Priestley in America. When he arrived in Philadelphia, the celebrity which he had acquired as a philosopher, chiefly as a chemist, procured him much attention, from many distinguished men; but the Presbyterian clergy did not recognize him as a minister of Christ Jesus; nor indeed did those of any of the Christain societies in the city. They were aware of his heretical opinions, and were resolved to shew him no countenance. Though he was introduced to many of the clergy, yet none of them invited him into their pulpits. In the Philadelphia academy there is a room appropriated to divine worship on the sabbath, for any denomination of Christians, who have no place of their own. In this Dr. Priestley was permitted to deliver his lectures, and was heard by crowded audiences, whom curiosity to hear a man of such celebrity drew together. Those opinions which he knew

were obnoxious, were kept out of view till the last lecture which he delivered, in which he unfolded, without disguise, his Socinian heresies. Some of the clergy of the city occasionally heard these lectures.

He formed an acquaintance with Dr. Ewing, and on one sabbath went with him to his church in Market street. The doctor introduced Priestley into his pew, without giving him an invitation into his pulpit, as was his custom, with those gentlemen whom he recognized as brethren in the ministry. The preachers too attacked, with great faithfulness, the heresies which Priestley was endeavouring to disseminate. He and his Socinian brethren were greatly offended with these insults, as they called them, and with the opposition made to his creed. They represented him as a persecuted apostle. Little did they consider that he was endeavouring to destroy every thing, which the great body of Christians, from the beginning of the world, had held most sacred,—that he was attempting to pluck the crown from the head of the Messiah, whom they adored, and to wrest from them all those hopes of salvation, which were founded upon his atoning sacrifice. Though much respect was shewn to the philosophical foreigner as a man of science, in both New York and Philadelphia, yet as his heresies rendered his very name unsavory to nearly all Christians, his situation was far from being comfortable. He indeed professed no anxiety to disseminate his principles, but as we learn from his life, and from some of his letters published since his death, it was the governing principle of all his actions, after he came to America. Among the common people he made little progress, but they were not the persons whom he was chiefly solicitous to gain over in the first instance. His object was the great. Among the distinguished persons with whom he became intimate was Mr. John Adams, at that time vice-president of the United States; who was his constant hearer while in Philadelphia,* and who it is said received the sacrament at his hands. Mr. Adams was no doubt honest in his preference of Dr. Priestley's ministry; on account of the

* Priestley's Life, Vol. II. p. 760.

creed which he held. Long before that period he was called an Arminian. Though we have no decisive testimony that Mr. Adams became a convert to the Socinian creed, yet from the honesty of his character, and the preference which he gave to Priestley's ministry, hardly a shadow of doubt exists that he did. In 1796, the first volume of Priestley's Evidences of revealed religion was published, and dedicated to the vice-president. To proselyte a president was in his view almost to convert a nation. In 1797, Mr. Adams was inaugurated president of the United States; and thus there is good reason to believe that the creed of Socinus was elevated to the highest official rank in the republic.

An offer was made to Dr. Priestley in the University of Pennsylvania, which he refused to accept, and settled in the town of Northumberland; from which he corresponded with the president.

Soon after Mr. Adams's elevation to the presidential chair, there was a commissioner to be appointed to Great Britain for the settlement of some important concerns. Before that time Thomas Cooper, Esq., Dr. Priestley's friend, had arrived from Europe. Mr. Cooper was his theological disciple and of the same political creed. Priestley wrote to President Adams, a letter, recommending Cooper as a fit person to be appointed on the embassy to England. The president with some temper, rejected the proposition, declaring that there were Americans capable of filling such stations. Dr. Priestley now perceived that Mr. Adams did not suit his purpose; that many acts of his administration were obnoxious to the people; that Pennsylvania was a powerful state, whose weight thrown into an opposite scale, would probably change the administration; and that he could perhaps produce more effect upon a person of another character, at the head of the government. He took his measures accordingly. A newspaper was established at Northumberland, under the patronage of Dr. Priestley and the friend on whose behalf he had made application. Many circumstances relative to this establishment and its editor were not very honourable to the doctor and his friend. In

this paper Dr. Priestley published several addresses to the people of Northumberland,* and in relation to the political state of the country. These addresses and numerous other articles from his pen, and that of Mr. Cooper, were published, not only in Northumberland, but circulated, by other papers, over the whole state, and produced very great effect on the election of an opposition governor in Pennsylvania; by which the whole weight of Pennsylvania was thrown into the scale in favour of Mr. Jefferson. He supplanted Mr. Adams. Though there were various other causes operating to produce this great political change, yet without the aid of Dr. Priestley and that of his friends' agency in Pennsylvania it is probable they would all have been ineffectual. Thus that Redeemer who governs the nations, made the very man, whom Mr. Adams had countenanced in his opposition to Messiah's divinity, one of the principal instruments of degrading him from the high station to which he had been elevated.

Priestley had great hopes of proselyting Mr. Jefferson to the faith of Socinus. He sent him a copy of his Comparison between Jesus Christ and Socrates, and received in return a complimentary letter from the president, who says he read the Comparison with great pleasure, and that he himself had promised Dr. Rush, in 1798-9, to write him a letter giving his views of the system of Jesus,—in which view, he says, he should have compared the system of Jesus with those of Pythagoras, Epictetus, &c. He says the view which he had proposed to take, "would purposely omit the question of his" (Christ's) "divinity, and even of his inspiration. To do him" (Christ) "justice it would be necessary to remark the difficulties, which his doctrines have to encounter, not having been committed to writing by himself, but by the most unlettered of men, by memory, long after they had heard them from him, when much was forgotten, much misunderstood, and presented in parodoxical

* Life of Priestley, vol. I. p. 201, 2, 3, 4.

shapes."* He thus gives his decision on the subject of inspiration and avows himself a deist. Priestley in a letter to Lindsey, at that time one of the most distinguished Unitarians, or Socinians, of England, speaks thus of Mr. Jefferson. "He," Mr. Jefferson, "is generally considered an unbeliever. If so, however, he cannot be far from us, and I hope in the way to be not only almost, but altogether what we are."† This is a strange confession for one, who had written so much against deism. Priestley considered deists as very nearly related to Socinians. Instead of a Socinian, Dr. Priestley had now the pleasure of seeing a reputed, and no doubt a really unbelieving president, who was still not far from him, at the head of the government of the United States.

Though this apostle of Socinianism had been one of the principal instruments of Mr. Adams's degradation from office, the effects of his intercourse with that gentleman did not cease to operate. The way had been paved in the north, for the introduction of Priestley's heresies into that section of the union. Very few indeed of the northern Arminians had proceeded so far before Priestley's arrival in America as to embrace the Arian or Socinian creed. There was one church in Boston, King's Chapel, under the care of Mr. Freeman, who as early as 1786, had, not without much opposition, introduced into his charge a liturgy modelled upon the unitarian plan; but it was not until 1801, that this liturgy was printed. This congregation was of the episcopal church, which, to their honour, refused to ordain Mr. Freeman to the ministry, on account of his heresy. In 1792, there was a small society of unitarians formed in the district of Maine, but it did not succeed. Soon after, there was one established at Saco, twenty miles from Portland, under the care of Mr. Thatcher, a member of congress. In the southern parts of Massachusetts, about Plymouth, Barnstable, and Bristol,

* Account of American Unitarianism, selected from Belsham's life of Lindsey.

† Ibid.

they made some proselytes. There was also a society formed at Aldenbarneveldt, whose preacher was Frederick Adrian Vanderkemp. He was succeeded by a Mr. John Sherman, who, for his heresies, had been degraded from his charge by an association in Connecticut.

Such was the state of things, when Mr. Adams became a hearer of Dr. Priestley, and probably an entire convert to his creed. It is well known that a president, or a king, possesses vast power over the opinions of a nation, especially of those persons with whom he associates. If a president is a Socinian, Socinianism will be popular; if a deist, deism; or if an idolater, idolatry; as was the case among the Israelites. In the United States, the total disseveration of politics from religion as far as human effort can go, renders this effect less visible, and something less in reality. Still the influence of a chief executive magistrate is very great. It must have been so with Mr. Adams, especially in Boston, the capital of his native state, in which his chief political supporters and most intimate friends resided. The books which he received from Dr. Priestley, and those with which Dr. Priestley made him acquainted, must, through his means, have been extensively circulated among his friends in Massachusetts. Mr. Adams was one of the trustees of Harvard university, and no doubt prodigiously accelerated the growth of heresy in that seminary. It is since his presidency, that nearly all the books of the Arians and Socinians have been introduced into the college library. The wealth and influence of the seminary have latterly increased to an alarming extent. Its funds are said to produce with the tuition money forty thousand dollars per annum. They have upwards of twenty professors or teachers constantly employed in the instruction of youth; and more than three hundred pupils. All the officers in the government of the institution except one are said to be unitarian; and there is not one who embraces the creed of the ancient fathers of New England. They are all gone aside. The principal is of the school of heresy, and there cannot be a doubt that every effort consistent with prudence has been made, and will be

made, to instil heresy into the minds of their pupils. The Hollis professorship is filled by Dr. Ware, an Arian, notwithstanding all the care the pious founder took to fortify it against such a malignant occupancy; and all the strenuous efforts of Dr. Jedidiah Morse to prevent heresy from seizing, contrary to all justice, the funds, which orthodoxy had appropriated for the spreading of evangelical truth. They say, indeed, that no pains are taken to teach the doctrines held by the faculty. But how is it possible for an Arian to lecture on theology without introducing Arianism into his lectures? And all the students must attend on Dr. Ware. From Harvard, missionaries are sent out into every section of the union, who are active and zealous in the dissemination of those deleterious tenets, which they have imbibed in the college.

With all this spreading of Arianism in Massachusetts, it is only at a very late period that the votaries of heresy in Boston have dared to exhibit publicly their opinions. A few years ago the General Repository, a theological magazine, was set on foot in Boston; and it must have gone into operation, with the approbation of most of the congregational clergy in that town. It attacked with virulence all the fundamental doctrines of the Christian system, such as the divinity of Christ, the trinity, the divine decrees, and the atonement. It is a favourable symptom, that for want of support it was relinquished. The common people of New England yet read the works of Davenport, of the Mathers, and other orthodox divines; and are not prepared to abandon wholly the faith of their fathers. After the death of Mr. Lindsey of England, Belsham, a celebrated Socinian, published his life. From this work, Dr. Morse published a selection of such parts as related to American unitarianism; by which some disagreeable truths were brought to light. To spread still farther a knowledge of the facts which this pamphlet contains, it was reviewed in the Panoplist, a very popular theological magazine. The Rev. Mr. Channing, a Boston clergyman, published a reply to the pamphlet and the review. He owns himself an Arian, and inveighs with

much earnestness against the review as calculated to disturb the church, and sow the seeds of division among Christians. To this, the Rev. Dr. Worcester of Salem published an answer, in which he contends, that either Mr. Channing and his Arian brethren, or those who are reputed orthodox in Massachusetts, do not preach the gospel of Christ Jesus;—that one or the other must be quite off the foundation;—and he establishes his position in the most incontestable manner. Mr. Channing again replied, and the controversy raged with violence, exciting the attention of all New England. It must do good, as it tends to develope before the eyes of the people the real state of the church; and tears the mask from those who have been underhanded in propagating the most destructive heresies. The Socinians say that they have one hundred Unitarian ministers in New England, and that their number is increasing. And who that considers the power of the university can doubt of the correctness of their statement? It is even probable, they have more. The whole congregational church in Massachusetts is in some degree chargeable with these heresies, on account of the countenance which they shew to those who maintain them. A general convention from all the churches in Massachusetts, was held in the summer of 1815, and Dr. Kirkland the principal of the university preached the opening sermon. Thus, though there is a distinct association for Boston, and though chiefly through the influence of the excellent Dr. Morse a general association, including a great portion of the churches of Massachusetts has been formed, yet the general convention in Boston forms a visible bond of union, and we see that in the convention, not only were the Arians acknowledged as ministers of Christ Jesus, but one of the most distinguished of them employed as the preacher to open the session of that body. No general association of the New England congregational churches, has publickly disowned the Arians as ministers of Christ Jesus; nor do we know, whatever individuals may have done, that the whole church has publicly testified against them. Thus

the enemy is let in to the destruction of God's heritage, while the watchmen hold their peace.

As in Europe, so in New England we see, that from the denial of the doctrine of the definite atonement a great body of the church has gone on to Socinianism. Will not the church take warning? We see too, that though Priestley, by his personal efforts, made very few proselytes, yet he has been the instrument of corrupting to the very core a large section of the American church; and that the work of evil is still in progression. God only, who says to the raging of the sea, hitherto shalt thou come and no farther, knows where it will end. At present, the flood of error threatens to deluge and bury in ruins not only the northern churches, but to spread devastation over other parts of the land.

That it has produced a very unhappy effect upon the public mind in the north, is manifest from recent political events. When the Federal constitution was formed, it is well known that many northern members of the convention contended for an acknowledgment of the government of Almighty God, and for a recognition of the Holy Scriptures as the rule of human conduct, as a qualification for office; and that, the effort failed of success. Among the articles proposed for amendment at the late famous Hartford convention, there was no mention made of this subject, to the great disappointment of many, who know the principles of most of the state constitutions of New England. When this fact was mentioned to the late excellent president Dwight, he said "he presumed that the members of the convention, would have been forward to propose such an important amendment, but that they thought the state of public feeling, on this point, among leading southern gentlemen, such as to render the proposition hopeless." We have no doubt, however, that the neglect proceeded from another source—that of many northern gentlemen being "not far from Mr. Jefferson in his unbelief." Many readers will probably think it extravagant to connect with the doctrine of the atonement and the character of Messiah, national movements. But let them

remember, that God has exalted Jesus in his mediatorial governm nt to the administration of the empire of the universe, as a reward of his sufferings in making this atonement; and that he governs all the machinery of creation, in subserviency to the interests of the church, which he has purchased with his blood. The doctrine of the atonement forms the centre about which all political, as well as all ecclesiastical bodies, revolve. Nations who honour Messiah and rejoice in the fruits of his atonement, he will honour; and will degrade those who dishonour him, and reject his atonement.

While the people in the eastern parts of Massachusetts, were thus marching forward, with rapid strides in the carreer of error, the people in the southern parts of New England owing partly to extraneous influence, were moving in the same direction, but with slower pace. The next distinguished writer on theology among the northern divines, after Dr Bellamy, was Dr. Hopkins of Newport, who advances several steps farther than his predecessor. His system of doctrines was published in 1792. On the doctrine of human depravity and inability he speaks thus:*—"The understanding, or intellect, considered as distinct from the will, is a natural faculty, and is not capable of moral depravity." He repeats the same sentiment, in a variety of shapes, without ever once admitting that the will is as much a natural faculty as the understanding; and that the understanding is as much concerned in our moral action as the will. On the subject of God's being the author of sin, Dr. Hopkins goes farther than Edwards, who says,† "If by the author of sin is meant the permitter, or not a hinderer of sin: and at the same time the disposer of the state of events, in such a manner, for wise, holy and most excellent ends and purposes, that sin infallibly follows; I say if this is all that is meant, by being the author of sin, I do not deny that God is the author of sin (though I dislike and reject the phrase

* Vol. I. p. 452. Boston.

† On Free Will. Edi. I. part IV. Sec. II. p. 254.

as that which by use and custom, is apt to carry another sense.)" Dr. Hopkins, explains much, but after all, a large portion of his system is occupied with attempts to prove that God is really the author of sin. "Hence he says in this view" (that of Edwards,) "he" (God,) "is really the origin and cause of moral evil, as really as he is of any thing which he wills." Edwards rejected the phrase; Hopkins adopts it, but with much explanation.

On the subject too of the good of the whole, on the doctrine of benevolence to being in general, he advances a little beyond Edwards. He says, "disinterested, impartial benevolence, to being in general that is capable of good and happiness, regards and wishes well to every being and creature in the system, according to the degree of his existence, worth and capacity of happiness, so far as all this comes into the view of the benevolent person.—And as he himself is one individual part of the whole, he must of necessity be the object of this disinterested, impartial benevolence—not because it is *himself*, but because he is included in the whole." He condemns all self love, and, indeed, represents it as the very essence of all sin. As to the sin of Adam, the doctor says, "it is not to be supposed that the sin of Adam is imputed to them while they are considered as innocent in themselves." *In consequence* of Adam's sin his posterity, he says, are depraved, and this is all that should be meant by original sin. The doctrine of imputation he denies.

Of the obedience and sufferings of Christ, he says:—"The law of God does not admit of a substitute, both in obeying the precepts and suffering the penalty of it." Again,—"This atonement therefore only delivers from the curse of the law, and procures the remission of their sins, who are in him; but does not procure for them any positive good: it leaves them under the power of sin, and without any title to eternal life." By his obedience to the law, according to this writer, Christ procured a title to everlasting blessedness for his people. "The vicarious atonement is of such a nature, that the sinner might lawfully be punished, after the sufferings of his substitute."

"The atonement is coextensive with the fall." "Infinite wisdom saw it best that redemption should not extend to all mankind." After all then the atonement really amounted to nothing. All might have been sentenced to hell, as many are, notwithstanding all Christ has done for them. God merely displayed his wrath against sin, by punishing an innocent person, and so it would seem that devils have really as much interest in the atonement, as men, and that devils as well as Christ, contribute to make it. It is impossible to make the various parts of his system consistent with each other.

In his discourse on the mode of preaching the gospel, he takes great pains to prove, that the preacher should press upon the sinner faith and repentance only, while he insinuates that prayer and other duties should not be performed by the sinner until he is converted. Others have followed the system out fully, and declared that all prayer should be abstained from, until after conversion. When this is reduced to practice, it really amounts to this, that a man must know himself to be regenerated before he may dare to pray or perform any duty,—a most mischievous tenet.

Many of those opinions are given with much explanation, and many salvos, such as, "in this sense,"—"with these explanations,"—"thus understood," &c. as if the author advanced with hesitancy and trembling anxiety. He appears to have been naturally a sensible man, and his works abound with pious traits. But led away by the opinions of others who had gone before him, by errors of education, and bewildered by metaphysical subtilties, he destroys the simplicity of gospel truth, and weaves into the web of his speculations gross errors, which when fairly disentangled and followed out, would destroy the covenant of works, the covenant of grace, and the work of redemption. He would himself have shuddered at the consequences drawn from his writings.

Dr. Emmons has succeeded him, and pretty fully developed his system, which is still evolving itself, and more and more displaying the extent of its deleterious power.

Dr. Emmons asserts "That God is possessed of affections which change, as the objects of those affections change," that he is "constrained to reject the eternal generation of the Son, and the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost," that "the fall has not disabled men, but that they can love God, repent of sin, believe in Christ, and perform every religious duty as well as they can think, or speak, or walk:"—that "by immediately acting upon the human heart, with energy to produce the volition, God produces every sinful act:"—that "it is out of the divine power so to impute guilt or disobedience, as to transfer either from Adam to his posterity, or from Christ to his people; so that Christ's righteousness is never in this sense imputed." He denies the existence of a covenant of works, and says that God by a secret constitution had determined if Adam should eat the forbidden fruit to make him a sinner.

To all this, West, Spring, and other divines of New England accede. There are shades of difference among those who are called Hopkinsians, hardly any two of them agreeing fully on those points; but generally it may be said of them all, however pious and excellent men many of them may be, that they have inaccurate notions of the object of worship, of the medium of worship, and of the character of the worshipper. 1. They have wrong conceptions of God the object of worship, as they make him to be the author of sin—as they represent him as decreeing hypothetically—as possessing changeable affections—of the generation of the Son, and the procession of the Holy Ghost, as not eternal—as doing all things out of benevolence, with a view to promote created happiness, and not from a regard to his own glory,—and as the avenger of sin, not of the sinner. 2. Of the medium of worship, Christ Jesus, as dying without any definite object, except it be to promote the good of the whole:—as not standing in the capacity of surety for his people, nor sustaining a representative character—and as instituting ordinances that are not means of grace. 3. Of the character of the worshipper, man, as possessed of natural power to obey all the divine commands; as bound not to love himself;

as bound to seek the good of the whole only; as never acting from any original corruption; as liable by nature to no punishment for Adam's sin; as not having the righteousness of Christ imputed to him; as regenerated in his will only, and not in all his faculties; as being compelled to sin by a positive influence from God; and as being a mere machine operated upon by his Maker.

It was not without many throes, that the New England churches brought forth these heresies. Bellamy tells us, that the revival of Whitefield gave occasion to the most violent contests; produced many evil passions, and factions among professors, all which he attributes to the agency of Satan, for defeating a glorious work. It was impossible that any society of good men, such as were formed in orthodox times, should without agitation, forsake the paths of truth, and wander so far into the mazes of error and false philosophy. The discussions on theological subjects were managed with considerable warmth of temper, but the writers on the side of innovation were much more numerous, than those on the side of truth. The friends of truth were never roused to general and vigorous action, not even when the citadel was taken. All are not, however, quite turned aside; although none of the opinions which we have exhibited wants advocates, among divines who are highly esteemed to the eastward; but those divines do not harmonize among themselves. Dr. Emmons, Dr. West, and Dr. Spring are among the most distinguished leaders in the new philosophy and divinity, which pervade generally almost all the denominations of Christians in Rhode Island, in the District of Maine, in the eastern part of Massachusetts, in Vermont and New Hampshire. We have every shade, from the genuine disciples of the Genevan school, to the thorough paced Socinian, though the former among the clergy is much more rare than the latter. The Rev. John Godman of Dorchester, indeed, is the only clergyman of Massachusetts, whom we know to be a thorough Calvinist. Much division has long existed between what are called the high-toned Hopkinsians, and the moderate Calvinists, or

semi-Arminians in Massachusetts. They are now said to be in a successful train of amalgamation, and that many of the most strong and offensive features of the Hopkinsians are softening; and among others that which exhibits a willingness to be damned for the glory of God, as the most decisive evidence of conversion. Still it is common in the revivals, to demand this "unconditional submission," as they are pleased to call it, to the will of God.

The clergy of Connecticut have made an honorable stand against the Arians and Socinians, whom they immediately degrade from their pastoral charges, as soon as they can establish their heresy. The consequence is, that there is probably not one of those heretics in the whole of Connecticut. The opinions of the ministers are generally in harmony with each other. They all believe in the trinity, the divinity of Christ, the divine decrees, Messiah's atonement, a particular election, the agency of the Holy Spirit in conversion, and other cardinal doctrines of the system of grace. On the subject of natural ability, they agree with the Hopkinsians in saying that man by nature labours under a total, but not a universal depravity, meaning a total depravity of the will alone; and that he possesses natural but not moral power to do all those moral actions that God enjoins. He wants the will they say, to choose the way of holiness, which he cannot do, but by the agency of the Holy Spirit. This defect in the will, they style "moral inability," and thereby do not seem to rank the will among the natural faculties. They maintain Bellamy's opinion relative to general atonement, and particular redemption, and may be called semi-Arminians.

Nearly all the congregational clergy of this state have been educated at Yale College, in the city of New-Haven, an ancient and very respectable seminary, which was founded about the beginning of the last century. It has always been an excellent institution, justly celebrated for its discipline, the talents of its professors, and the industry and morality of its students. Though it is not so rich as Harvard, yet it has been well supported. It was many

years under the care of the late Dr. Timothy Dwight, a most amiable and excellent man, who during the four years' course of study for each class, delivered a course of lectures on theology to all the students. In this course he taught the doctrines of the Calvinistic school, except on the two points, mentioned above; and of course the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin, and of Christ's righteousness, could not have such a prominent place in his system, as in that of the Genevan doctors. His influence was deservedly great in the northern churches, and his reputation high, not only in America; but in Europe. He was a vigorous opposer of the Boston heresies, from which he had great influence in preserving the church in Connecticut, and in the west of Massachusetts. If the church in those parts did not retrace any of its steps during the time of his presidency, it may be safely affirmed, that it did not recede farther from the truth, into the paths of delusion. The college under his administration generally had nearly three hundred students, an unusually large proportion of whom, devoted themselves to the ministry, and preached the doctrines which he had taught them. What influence this school will have hereafter upon the state of the church in New England, will depend much on the character and opinions of its next principal. The people of Boston call this a Calvinistic school and New-Haven a Calvinistic city, on which account many of them make it an object of ridicule, and would wish to see its character sink.

While there are many points about which the congregational clergy of New England, who are opposed to the Socinians, cannot agree, they have all united in the support of a theological seminary at Andover, in Massachusetts. This school was opened in 1808, and as to numbers and influence, has flourished probably beyond the expectation of its founders. In the village, where it is located, there had been long established a literary institution, called Phillips' academy, one of the most respectable of its grade in the state. In order to found a divinity school Samuel Abbot,

Esq. gave a donation of 20,000 dollars, and Mrs. Phillips, and her son, John Phillips, Esq. gave the money for erecting the buildings. Great additions have since been made to its funds by the extraordinary liberality of other private donations, rendering it rich and powerful. Mr. Bartlett of Newburyport, was a great benefactor; Mr. Moses Brown, of the same town, presented it with 10,000 dollars; Mr. William Brown, with 20,000 dollars, and Mr. Norris with 30,000 dollars, for the support of several professors. Such acts are highly honourable to the donors, and worthy of imitation by every friend of genuine orthodoxy. The direction of this theological establishment, is under the trustees of Phillips' academy, of which it is a branch. Its library consists of nearly three thousand volumes. The Rev. Dr. Griffin, the Rev. Messrs. Stuart, Woods and Porter, have been their professors. The number of pupils is upwards of sixty; among all of whom, professors and pupils, there is probably not one who does not maintain the doctrine of general atonement, natural ability, unconditional submission, and other Hopkinsian peculiarities. In relation to doctrine, it may be considered an American Saumur, except, that the doctrine of Christ's eternal sonship, is said not to be among the articles of faith, taught at Andover. A desire to spread Hopkinsianism, it would seem, is nearly always present in the minds of the professors and pupils of Andover.

Their peculiar tenets have a prominent place in the correspondence of the young men, while prosecuting their studies; and when they commence preaching, in their pulpit exhibitions. The spirit of proselytism, is a most striking feature of their character, and leads them to lay greater stress on the errors which they have imbibed, than on the great and consolatory doctrines of the Christian faith. It seems to be nearly impossible for them to compose a sermon without interweaving them into the fabric; so intimately are they connected with every principle, which they maintain, or so zealous are the preachers to propagate them. Their success too is as great as extraordinary zeal in either a good or bad cause will generally secure. While their piety seems to be,

and we hope is great, it is tinctured with all their aberrations from the glory of the gospel.

Some have thought, that this seminary would form a barrier against the spread of the Boston heresies, which it opposes with great zeal. The Unitarians, do not themselves seem to think so, for while they write against the Andoverians in the General Repository, for maintaining the divinity of Christ, and the atonement, they at the same time compliment them as much nigher to themselves, than the old Calvinists, and have no doubt penetration enough to see, that the tenets taught in this great centre of operations for the New-England churches, do, in their nature and necessary consequences, lead to the Socinian ground. That this will be the result, as it has been in France, a few years will shew, unless the head of the church purify this fountain by casting into it the salt of truth. Several of the Anti-Trinitarians of Massachussetts we well know were but lately Hopkinsians.

We now invite the attention of the reader to New-York. In this city, the Dutch Reformed church established itself soon after the commencement of the colony by the Hollanders, and taught the same doctrines relative to the atonement, with those which were held by the church in Holland, from which it was descended. Though there were, in this branch of the church, which planted colonies of Reformers along the banks of the Hudson, and in New-Jersey, divisions arising out of local considerations, yet all embraced the Heidelburgh Catechism as the standard of faith, and explained that part of it which relates to the extent of the atonement, in strict conformity with the tenets of the Genevan school. It was a standing custom among the Dutch clergy to deliver courses of lectures on this catechism, and in these lectures, they uniformly taught and enforced the doctrine of the divine decrees, particular election, definite atonement, the efficacy and necessity of the agency of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, the imputation of Adam's sin, the total and universal depravity of human nature, and the imputation of Christ's righteousness received by faith,

as the only ground of our justification before God. Through the exertions of the Rev. John H. Livingston, D. D. whose ancestors at an early period, emigrated to New-York from Holland, and who completed his theological education in the land of his forefathers, the divisions, which had existed, were healed, and a tone of considerable energy imparted to this ecclesiastical body. Though the clergy were not profoundly versed in human literature, yet they were intelligent, upright, pious and industrious; and this church embraced many members of great respectability, whose influence was exerted on the side of orthodoxy. New-York was the centre of their operations. The presbyterian church, now called the General Assembly of Presbyterians, had become a powerful and respectable body in this city, before the commencement of the present century. The most distinguished of the ministers of this body, was the Rev. John Rogers, D. D. who for upwards of fifty years, was employed in ministering at the altar, and for all that time maintained an unblemished reputation, and was exemplary for piety and dignity, becoming the ministerial character. He was rigidly orthodox. He might be called the father of the presbyterian church in New-York.

The Antiburgher Seceders, had a congregation organised in New-York, under the pastoral care of the Rev. Mr. Hamilton. In their creed they were orthodox; and except on the doctrine relative to the power of the civil magistrate in relation to ecclesiastical affairs, embraced the Westminster Confession of Faith.

Here too, the Associate Reformed Presbyterians, had erected their standard. This body was formed by a union between the Reformed Presbyterians, or Covenanters, who had emigrated to America, and the Seceders, in the year 1782, when its first synod met at Greencastle, a small town in the interior of Pennsylvania, and consisted of about twelve ministers. One of the principal agents in effecting this union, was the Rev. Dr. Mason, of New-York, who had emigrated from Scotland. Like the anti-burgher Seceders, they adopted the Westminster Confession, excepting that part which

treats of the power of the civil magistrate about religion. The church under the direction of this synod grew rapidly, and though there was not a perfect harmony among the members, owing to the remains of the principles and feelings, which the parties united brought with them across the Atlantic, yet they were all perfectly correct in their views of the doctrine of the atonement. Their clergy possessed no small share of learning, for no man was admitted to preach the gospel among them without having received a liberal education, and they received many accessions to their presbyteries, from the judicatories in Britain. Nearly all the ministers of the Burgher synods in Scotland and Ireland, who emigrated to America, joined them. They generally harmonized in their operations, and the views which they held and taught were perfectly Calvinistic. After the death of the Rev. Dr. Mason, the congregation elected his son, the Rev. John M. Mason, D. D. who had gone to Europe to complete his theological studies in Britain. He immediately returned to New-York, and was ordained to the pastoral charge of the Associate Reformed Congregation in that city. He possessed an expanded mind, and saw that no church was likely to become permanently influential or powerful, without a learned ministry, and that the means of theological education in the United States were limited. Through his exertions chiefly, a theological school was formed under the patronage of the synod to which he was attached, and located in New-York. He was himself appointed the theological professor. A considerable number of young men from various parts of the Associate Reformed Church, and from other denominations of presbyterians, soon commenced the study of theology in this seminary. Their Confession of Faith, the same with that formed at Westminster, except on the article of civil government, was taken as the text book in divinity. The whole influence of this institution, was of course, thrown into the Calvinistic scale.

At Dr. Mason's return from Europe, a considerable number of clergy from the Burgher synod of Scotland, emigrat-

ed to America, and one of them, Mr. Forrest, was settled in the pastoral charge of the Second Associated Reformed Congregation, of which the Rev. John X. Clarke, is now pastor.

This union, however, did not destroy the two bodies from which it was formed, as many both of the Associate Synod and the Reformed Synod, did not join it; hence both of them preserved their distinct organization. In New-York, there was a congregation organized on Covenanting principles, and Mr. Alexander M'Leod, (now the Rev. Dr. M'Leod) was ordained to the pastoral charge of it. This gentleman is descended from the family of M'Leod, in the Hebrides. His father was a minister of the Scottish established church. He is mentioned in the Tour of Dr. Johnson to the Hebrides; who says of him, that he would have done honour to a more elevated station than the one which he filled.* Young M'Leod, was early devoted to the ministry, and with a view to it commenced his education. When young, he emigrated to America, and completed his collegiate education at Union college, after having connected himself with the Reformed Presbyterian church. He received the honours of his class. Soon after he began to preach, his talents as a preacher, and the argumentative character of his eloquence, procured him offers from wealthy congregations, which he rejected; resolving not to forsake the small body with which he had connected himself, as he was fully convinced, that the system of principles which they held, was founded on the sacred oracles.

Soon after his settlement in New-York, he published a sermon against negro slavery, on account of which Gregoire of France, couples him with Thomas Jefferson, as a defender of the rights of humanity. He also published a catechism on ecclesiastical government, in which he vindicates presbyterianism. It was soon republished in Europe. This catechism was the means of awakening a controversy between

* In some copies the name of his grandfather is inserted by mistake.

the Presbyterians and the Episcopalians of New-York, on the subject of church government.

Soon after the conquest of the Dutch colony by the Duke of York, the episcopal church established itself in New-York, and derived liberal support from grants by the crown of England. When Trinity church was chartered, the glebe lands attached to it on Manhattan island, were extensive, and rapidly increasing in value. A remarkable spirit of activity was infused into all its fiscal arrangements. So powerful were the funds of this church, that after the Revolution, the state legislature limited them to a capital, producing an annual revenue of five thousand pounds. Their estate, however, produced much more, and they devoted all that exceeded the specified amount, to the building and endowment of new churches. At the time when M'Leod's catechism appeared, serious fears were entertained by the Presbyterian church, that the Episcopalians would become so powerful as to exercise an undue influence over the political affairs of the state. All this power was exerted in the propagation of the Arminian errors. For this body, while it adopted the Thirty Nine Articles of the church of England, and the liturgy, was not, like the parent society, composed partly of Calvinists and partly of Arminians; for all were Arminians.

A Magazine was set on foot by the Presbyterian interest, under the editorial care of Dr. Mason, and though much valuable matter on other subjects, was thrown into it, the grand object was to combat the Episcopal form of church government. On this subject, the editor and several other ministers of the Presbyterian church wrote largely and ably. The Rev. Dr. Miller, a gentleman who was educated in the university of Pennsylvania, and who had become generally known to advantage, by his Review of the Eighteenth Century, published a very temperate and lucid discussion on the same subject, in a small volume of Letters. Bishop Hobart appeared as the champion of the Episcopal church. This gentleman was educated at Princeton college, at which he was distinguished. He had published a work, styled the Companion for the Altar, in which he intimated, as his

brethren had often done before in England, that the Episcopal is the only true church, and that there alone, salvation is attainable, unless it be by "uncovenanted mercy." This controversy was managed with much warmth and zeal by the parties. The doctrine of the atonement was only brought into this discussion incidentally. But Dr. M'Leod published in the Christian's Magazine, the title of the periodical work alluded to above, a number of essays expressly on this subject. The papers are written with very great talent, and contain an able vindication of the doctrines of the Genevan school. The essays published in the Magazine on the subject of ecclesiastical government, and written by Dr. Mason, made an attack merely upon the walls of the city; Dr. M'Leod's discussions on the atonement, attacked the citadel, where Arminianism had fortified itself. All had a bearing upon the same point, the propagation of correct views relative to the way of salvation through Jesus Christ; for in proportion as Episcopalianism prevails in the United States in the same proportion will be the spread of the Arminian, errors unless the teachers can be brought back to their discarded *Articles*.

At the time when the presbyterian clergy of all denominations, the Dutch Reformed, the General Assembly, the Associate Reformed, and the Reformed Presbyterians, united in opposing Episcopacy, they harmonized among themselves. They were indeed entirely distinct from each other in their ecclesiastical judicatories, in their exercise of discipline, and in their ecclesiastical communion, but a spirit of cordiality prevailed among them. A clerical association, in which they all united, had been formed, and had existed for many years, in which the clergy of these denominations, met weekly for the cultivation of Christian knowledge, religion, and personal friendship. This association was attended by the Rev. Drs. Rogers, Livingston, M'Knight, M'Leod, Mason, Milledollar, Abeel, Miller, and Romeyn; and the Rev. Messrs. Hamilton, Forrest and others. All these were cordial in their support of the Calvinistic creed.

Such was the state of the presbyterian churches in New York, when their repose was disturbed by Hopkinsianism poured down upon them from the North. After the formation of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, a connection was established between it and the northern congregationalists. Delegates from the congregational associations were admitted to a seat in the General Assembly; and from that body delegates were sent to the General Northern Associations. Ministers and licentiates of the congregational churches were admitted to the pulpits of the presbyterian clergy in the middle, southern, and western states. In numerous instances availing themselves of this privilege, they had disturbed the repose of the churches, by the Hopkinsian doctrines which they taught.

In 1813, two young gentlemen, the Rev. Ezra Stiles Ely and Mr. Gardiner Spring, a licentiate, the former a native of Connecticut, and the latter of Massachusetts, both of them educated in Yale college, arrived in New York. Mr. Spring is the son of the Rev. Dr. Spring, a Hopkinsian writer of the state of Massachusetts. The doctrines of the father had been embraced by the son, who finished his course of study at Andover. Mr. Ely had been for some time pastor of a congregation in Connecticut. He was admitted to a seat in the presbytery of New York as a member. His views had not been very distinct on the doctrine of the atonement in relation to its extent, nor as to the doctrine of natural and moral ability, before his arrival at New York. As soon as he became acquainted with the doctrines of the Calvinistic school upon these points, he embraced them. Mr. Spring received a call from a congregation in that city, and read before the presbytery a sermon as a trial discourse for ordination, in which he exhibited the Hopkinsian doctrine of natural ability. "After he had retired, and the moderator, and the other members after him, in the order of seniority, were asked whether they would sustain the discourse;—every member of the presbytery thought the sermon unsound in doctrine, and most of them said they would not sustain it, nor proceed to the ordina-

tion of Mr. Spring, if they did not believe he had written the sermon in haste, and would, on a little reflection, renounce the doctrines which it contained.—Mr. Ely being called on to give his opinion, said, that were he in Mr. Spring's case, he should desire to be recalled to the presbytery, that he might have an opportunity of explaining more fully his sentiments, of rectifying wrong apprehensions, and of ascertaining how far he differed from the persons, with whom he was about to be connected. He advised, therefore, that Mr. Spring should be sent for, before the final question was decided, for Mr. Ely was much in mistake, if Mr. Spring would not vindicate more strongly to-morrow, whatever sentiments he had designed to advance to-day."* This plan was not adopted. But at the suggestion of the commissioner, who prosecuted the call, it was agreed to call on Mr. Spring after his ordination, and endeavour to reclaim him from his errors, and teach him more perfectly the doctrines of salvation. This plan was adopted for the preservation of peace, and to save the people of the Brick church, who had made the call upon Mr. Spring, from a disappointment. Thus the presbytery ordained a man to the ministry, though they could not doubt that he held principles directly at war with those of that confession of faith, to which they demanded of him an assent, and a promise of adherence. It may seem strange that an honest man should make such a promise, but with the help of explanations, many men can promise support to almost any system. As it has happened in all other cases where truth and duty were compromitted for the sake of peace, the object was not gained. The introduction of Mr. Spring into the presbytery was the signal of war; the tocsin was sounded, and a perpetual scene of contest, has been ever since exhibited on this theatre. The harmony of the presbytery has fled, and seems resolved never to return.

At the instance of Dr. Samuel Miller and others Mr.

* History of Ecclesiastical Proceedings relative to the third Presbyterian church in Philadelphia, &c.

Ely wrote a paper exhibiting a contrast between Hopkinsianism and the doctrines of the Genevan school. After it was written, he was advised to enlarge and publish it in the form of a book, which he did, under the title of "A Contrast between Calvinism and Hopkinsianism." This work contains a great deal of very interesting matter. The public confessions of the reformed churches, and the opinions of distinguished divines, are collated with each other, and contrasted with those of Dr. Hopkins and his followers. We see exhibited, in one view, the harmony of the former with each other, their discrepancy with the latter, and the disagreement of the latter with one another. To the chapters of the Contrast, the author has appended dissertations, in which he defends with decision the doctrines of the Calvinistic school. Mr. Ely could not but be aware of the onset which awaited him, but he generously planted himself in the breach, and braved every danger, with a heroism, that posterity will applaud, whatever may be thought of it by his lukewarm contemporaries. The Socinians, the Hopkinsians and the Methodists, magazines and pamphleteers, attacked him furiously from every quarter, while many lukewarm brethren either left him to struggle with his fate, or joined with his enemies in the outcry raised against him, as "a mover of sedition and a turner of the world upside down." A great number, however, of the clergy, and that of the most respectable, warmly recommended the Contrast. But the approbation of a good conscience and of that Redeemer whose truth he defends are rewards, which far exceed all others, and incomparably more than counterbalance all that persecution has inflicted upon him.

The Contrast is so well written, that Dr. Joseph Lyman of Massachussetts declared in an Association of Hopkinsians, that Dr. Mason had written it; whereas he never saw a line of it until it was published. Others still ascribe it to some older man, under pretence that a youth at twenty-five could not have been the author of so able a work.

What Mr. Ely said respecting Mr. Spring's maintaining doctrines exhibited in his sermon before the presbytery was

fully justified by the event. He did not hesitate to avow all the opinions taught at the Andover school, and exerted all his energies to propagate them. The controversy raged in private families, and disturbed the peace of congregations. Hopkinsian books were circulated, and every machine put in motion to render prevalent the errors which they contained.

Dr. M'Leod commenced a course of lectures from his pulpit on sabbath evenings, in which he gave a history of the origin and progress of Hopkinsianism, and combated the system with arguments drawn both from scripture and reason, with all the force of his eloquence. He was heard by crowded audiences, and a great interest was excited by his discussions. All the efforts, however, of the orthodox were not sufficient to arrest the progress of the errors, which were introduced at the door opened for them by the presbytery. It was not long until the Hopkinsian party obtained, by accessions from New England principally, a majority among the ministers of the presbytery. To the introduction of one of these, the Rev. Walter King, Mr. Ely gave the only dissentient vote; even though Mr. King was the intimate friend of himself and of his father; because the following dialogue was heard by the presbytery and recorded at the time.

Question by Mr. *Ely*. Can any man, strictly speaking, be declared guilty of original sin, excepting Adam?

Answer by Mr. *King*. No.

Mr. *Ely*. Have fallen men all that intellectual power which is requisite to perfect obedience?

Mr. *King*. Yes.

Mr. *Ely*. Has the sinner any union to Christ before saving faith in Christ is wrought in his soul?

Mr. *King*. Doubtful.

The last question was proposed because Mr. King had asserted that he had been himself the subject of saving repentance for several months before he had any saving faith in Christ. Many other questions were proposed which he declined answering. But let us not attribute to the presbytery too much blame, because they could not foresee the

future conduct of some who made an orthodox profession. One who became for a considerable time "Mr. Spring's bully of Hopkinsianism," was the Rev. Henry P. Strong, sometime pastor of a presbyterian church in Elizabeth-street, which became extinct under the blighting influence of his doctrines, in a few months after its organization. He came from Connecticut to New York in the character of a licentiate. While the presbytery had him under examination for ordination, Mr. Ely insisted on proposing to to him several propositions, that he might express to the presbytery his approbation or disapprobation of them. Mr. Spring requested a previous sight of them, and having read them objected to their being proposed; saying at the same time, that Mr. Ely, from his knowledge of the technical language of divinity in the north and south, was better able to *entrap* the candidate for ordination than any other member of the presbytery. The presbytery overruled the objection, and the following propositions were submitted to the consideration of Mr. Strong.

"I. The Holy Ghost unites a sinner to Christ, by working in him faith in God's testimony of grace.

"II. A person not united to Christ in this spiritual and mystical union, cannot be the subject of any one saving grace, any more than the branch can bear fruit without union to the vine.

"III. All the Christian graces will coexist in that person who has been made alive to God, by the saving belief of the truth as it is in Jesus.

"IV. In the decree of election, God gave Christ a definite number of our fallen race; and by the consent of the Son of God, appointed him to *merit* for them, by obeying the moral law and suffering its penalty for their sins, complete pardon, justification, sanctification and salvation.

"V. To fulfil this decree was *the main object* of the incarnation, obedience, suffering, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

"VI. The sins of the elect were legally imputed to Christ, so that he was actually made a curse for them, and was

punished for their sins, even to the utmost demands of the moral law.

"VII. That obedience which Christ performed to the law for the elect sinner, is legally imputed to him; so that God declares the sinner, who is *personally* unjust, to be *legally* just on account of the vicarious righteousness of his substitute.

"VIII. The law which the sinner has violated, is that very law in relation to which the sinner is pronounced, by vicarious obedience, to be just."

To the question, "do you believe each of these propositions to be true?" Mr. Strong gave publicly an affirmative answer, and then, either not understanding the force of language, or explaining it away, preached and taught Hopkinsianism, and particularly universal atonement, with boldness and assiduity. By such means any presbytery might be ruined. It is thought, however, that by exertions to procure a full representation from the sessions, the orthodox in the presbytery of New York could still have a majority, as the ruling elders are generally Calvinistic in their sentiments.

Each of the parties expressed a belief that it could command a majority in the general assembly. The subject of the atonement in relation to the controverted points, in three instances, had come before that body. One was from the west. The presbyterian church had become powerful beyond the Alleghany mountains. The first presbyterian minister settled in that country, was the Rev. (now Dr.) John M'Millan, who was ordained to the pastoral charge of a congregation on Chartiers creek in Washington county. In 1779, he opened a grammar school with a view to educate young men for the ministry. Many pious men received the rudiments of an education in this seminary, studied theology under Mr. M'Millan, were ordained to the ministry, performed missionary labours through the new settlements then forming, organized congregations, and were settled in the pastoral office. They were but superficially versed in human literature, and their study of theology

was not very systematic, nor very extensive; but they were pious, industrious, and altogether Calvinistic on the doctrine of the atonement. The character of the devotions of the western people was rather affectionate than intellectual. In many instances the sermons of the clergy, owing to the ardor of their zeal and the want of solid learning, were rather of the declamatory character.

In 1802, there was a great religious excitement, produced by some unknown individual, on Green Briar river, in west Virginia. It spread into Kentucky, and vast crowds of people, amounting to many thousands from distant parts, assembled at camp meetings, at which they spent many days and nights in devotional exercises. These exercises were accompanied with loud cries, groans, alarming bodily agitations and convulsions. During the first stages, it possessed all the features which characterized the Whitefieldian revival. It extended over the greater part of west Pennsylvania, west Virginia, and Ohio; every where possessing the same character. But in Kentucky and Ohio, a few of the leading ministers in promoting it went to lengths of extravagance, which alarmed the more sober part of those Christians who approved it, and thought it a glorious revival. The Rev. Messrs. Marshall, Stone, Dunlevi, and M'Nemar, were the leaders in these extravagancies. When their brethren would not go the whole length with them, they formed a presbytery, and in an exhibition of their principles which they published, renounced presbyterianism. Their first step was a rejection of the doctrine of decrees and definite atonement; their second, a renunciation of the atonement altogether; and their third, of presbyterianism. They now gave themselves up to extravagancies, which shock every feeling of decency. Had it not been for the efforts of the Rev. Dr. John P. Campbell, who published replies to their books, and refutations of their wild principles, the church in Kentucky and Ohio would have been almost overwhelmed by them. In this the doctor was aided by the ministers of all the other Presbyterian denominations who had opposed the revival from its commencement, as cha-

racterized by enthusiasm, rather than by enlightened devotion.

The Rev. Mr. Marshall, the most intelligent of those who had gone to lengths so extravagant, was convinced of his errors, by reading in the Christian's Magazine, the essays on the atonement that have been mentioned before, as coming from the pen of Dr. M'Leod. He used his influence with his brethren to bring them to their right mind, and with some of them he was successful. They now made application to the General Assembly, to be restored to the communion of the church, which, after much deliberation, was granted to them.

When the revival was about subsiding in the western part of Pennsylvania, Dr. Watts' book, in which he teaches Sabellianism, was circulated and read by many who embraced this heresy. But when the excitement entirely passed away they seem to have returned to the orthodox faith. They were never brought before the judicatories of the church. A second instance in which this doctrine was brought before the General Assembly, was, in consequence of the publication of a book entitled the Gospel Plan, by the Rev. Mr. Davis. In this work, he revives the opinion of Piscator of France, and asserts that the suffering of the penalty of the broken covenant was all that Christ did in the room of sinners. He takes for granted the doctrine taught by President Edwards in his History of Redemption, that Christ owed obedience to the law for himself as a creature, and that hence his obedience can constitute no part of our justifying righteousness before God.

Mr. Davis' book was referred to the General Assembly, which appointed on it a committee, whose report, which was adopted, is as follows:—

"The committee presuming that a complete enumeration of all the objectionable parts of said book is not expected, called the attention of the Assembly only to the following doctrines, supposed to be contrary to the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian church.

"Doctrine 1st, That the active obedience of Christ con-

stitutes no part of that righteousness by which a sinner is justified. See pages of said book, 257, 261, and 264; 3d corollary.

"Doctrine 2d, That obedience to the moral law was not required as the condition of the covenant of works. See pages 178 and 180. The aforesaid pages being read, it was on motion, Resolved, that this Assembly do consider these doctrines as contrary to the Confession of Faith of our church.

"Doctrine 3d, God himself is as firmly bound in duty (not obedience) to his creatures, as his creatures are bound in duty or obedience to him. See pages 164 and 166; also that God's will is not the standard of right and wrong. If God's will is the primary rule of his or our actions, he would be,—1. Entirely void of all holiness;—2. There could be no justice in God;—3. It would be impossible for God to be unchangeable;—4. If the will of God is the standard of right and wrong, then it would be no infringement on the divine character to be unfaithful to his word and promise. See pages 168, 171. These pages were read.

"Resolved, that without deciding on the question, whether these sentiments are contrary to our Confession of Faith, the Assembly consider the mode in which they are expressed as unhappy, and calculated to mislead the reader.

"Doctrine 4th, That God could not make Adam, or any other creature, either holy or unholy. See page 194, compared with 166.

"Doctrine 5th, Regeneration must be a consequence of faith. Faith precedes regeneration. See page 352.

"Doctrine 6th, That faith, in the first act of it, is not an holy act. See page 358. The pages above referred to being read, it was on motion, Resolved, That the Assembly do consider the three last mentioned doctrines contrary to the Confession of Faith of our church.

"Doctrine 7. That Christians may sin wilfully and habitually. See pages 532 and 534. These pages were read.

"Resolved, That the Assembly consider the expressions in the pages referred to, as very unguarded; and so far as

they intimate it to be the author's opinion, that a person may live in habitual sin and yet be a Christian, the Assembly considers them contrary to the letter and spirit of the Confession of Faith of our church, and in their tendency highly dangerous.

"Doctrine 8th, If God has to plant all the principal parts of salvation in the sinner's heart, to enable him to believe, the gospel plan is quite out of his reach, and consequently does not suit his case; and it must be impossible for God to condemn a man for unbelief; for no just law condemns or criminates any person for not doing what he cannot do. See page 413. This page and several others on the same subject, being read,

"Resolved, That the Assembly do consider this last mentioned doctrine contrary to the Confession of Faith of our church.

"On the whole, Resolved, That this Assembly cannot but view with disapprobation various parts of the work entitled "The Gospel Plan," of which William C. Davis is stated in the title page to be the author.

"In several instances in this work modes of expression are adopted, so different from those which are sanctioned by use and by the best orthodox writers, that the Assembly consider them as calculated to produce useless or mischievous speculations.

"In several other instances, there are doctrines asserted and vindicated, as have been already decided, contrary to the Confession of Faith of our church, and the word of God, which doctrines the Assembly feel constrained to pronounce to be of very dangerous tendency; that the preaching or publishing them ought to subject the person or persons so doing to be dealt with by their respective presbyteries according to the discipline of the church relative to the propagation of errors."

In this business, the General Assembly acted with a noble firmness and decision, which we hope they will always display on similar occasions. Had the Reformed church in France used as much faithfulness, their affairs would not

have been reduced to such a state of desperation as they soon were by a contrary course.

Twenty years ago, there was scarcely one Hopkinsian minister connected with the General Assembly, and now we are astonished and alarmed at the rapid increase of them. In Kentucky, it is said that more than one half of the ministers belonging to the General Assembly are Hopkinsian, at least in part. The Boston Unitarians have their missionaries in that state, who are making some progress, but not among the Presbyterians. In the synod of Pittsburgh there are probably not more than three or four ministers who hold the doctrine of general or indefinite atonement; and of these one is a thorough disciple of Hopkins. But were the great question brought to a decision before the Assembly, the weight of that synod would be found in the orthodox scale; and it is a powerful body. Nearly all the presbyterian clergy in the state of Ohio, are anti-Hopkinsian. It is about twenty years since Hopkinsianism became known in the state of Tennessee. The Rev. Hezekiah Balch from that state, spent some time with Dr. Emmons, embraced his errors, and taught them both in the pulpit and in private. Many of his brethren soon imbibed them. The most distinguished of his converts is, the Rev. Gideon Blackburn, who was settled in the congregation of Maryville, in east Tennessee, where his ministry had been remarkably successful. Soon after he embraced Hopkinsianism, disturbances arose in his congregation, and he migrated to west Tennessee, where he opened a school, and was settled in the pastoral charge of a congregation. Dr. Coffin too, the principal of Washington College, came from Newburyport warm with the sentiments of Dr. Spring, and has taught them from the pulpit and the press. There is still in east Tennessee much opposition to Hopkinsianism. The Rev. Mr. Doak, principal of Greenville college, is a sound, sensible divine, and has educated a considerable number of clergymen, who unite with him in defence of the truth. Through the instrumentality of Mr. Doak, Mr. Balch was brought before the General Assembly at its sessions of 1798,

for his Hopkinsian delusions; which after a patient examination were condemned. The false doctrines enumerated are nearly the same with those which we have before delineated, as taught in the north. Every one of them was condemned. It is gratifying, that in this condemnatory sentence there was not one dissenting voice among the Presbyterian delegates to the General Assembly. Two ministers indeed, did vote against it, but they were both delegates from a northern association. Like Amyraut, Mr. Balch did not regard the decision of the Assembly. Few who embrace these errors are ever reclaimed. "Backsliders are filled with their own ways." His errors struck deep their roots. The controversy in Tennessee has raged with violence; and as it has done in every other place, deprived the church of repose. Upon the whole, both in east and west Tennessee, the parties are probably at present nearly equal. In Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina, the northern tares are gaining ground. The Rev. Dr. Maxcy, the principal of South Carolina college, a very powerful seminary, is decidedly anti-Calvinistic on several subjects. This gentleman belongs to the Baptist church.

In Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware, few of the Presbyterians have yet abandoned the good old paths of righteousness. The Rev. Mr. Baxter, the principal of Washington college at Lexington in Virginia, is orthodox. Hampden-Sidney college has been lately connected with the theological school of the synod of Virginia, in which there are between thirty and forty students, a considerable portion of whom are preparing for the gospel ministry. The Rev. Moses Hoge, D. D. a gentleman of high standing as a scholar, a divine, and a preacher, who is sound in the faith, occupies the two offices of president and professor. This theological seminary must produce a very salutary effect on the affairs of the Presbyterian church in the south.

The synod of Philadelphia is a numerous and respectable body, in the Calvinistic interest. Though there is not an entire harmony among the members on all points, yet a very great majority of them are opposed to the Hopkinsian

opinions. Events which occurred in the city of Philadelphia during the winter of 1815-16, gave occasion for an expression of the opinion of this synod. A Mr. Cox, who was educated in the Quaker society, renounced the Quaker creed, united himself with the Presbyterian church, and entered upon the study of theology. Though he did not possess a liberal education, yet such was his zeal, that without waiting to go through a collegiate course, he resolved to become a preacher after some preparatory studies in theology. The Rev. James Patterson, who had formerly been settled in a congregation in New Jersey, had been more than a year before installed in a pastoral charge in the Northern Liberties. His earnest addresses from the pulpit produced a great awakening among the people who worshipped in his church, and upwards of seventy persons were admitted to membership at one sacramental solemnity. The excitement extended itself partially into other congregations in the northern part of the city. Many week evening societies were held for prayer and exhortation. At these meetings, Mr. Cox took a very conspicuous part, and while pressing religion upon the worshippers, in his exhortations, taught with great zeal the Hopkinsian errors which he had been primarily taught in Newark. Two or three ministers of the Presbyterian church were also charged with inculcating both publicly and privately the same opinions, while they were very active in endeavours to increase the religious excitement. The Hopkinsian controversy began to be kindled, and serious fears were entertained by the orthodox that injurious opinions would be propagated too successfully, while feeling, instead of judgment, conscience, and revelation, predominated.

The presbytery of Philadelphia contained at this time the Rev. Dr. Janeway, then senior and now sole pastor of the Second Presbyterian church, who was educated r d has ever maintained, all the systematic consistency in vinism of the venerable president Livingston; the Rev. eorge C. Potts, a sound Presbyterian, who was educated at Glasgow college; the Rev. Mr. How, who has lately been re-

moved to Trenton, in New Jersey; the Rev. Messrs. Ely, Belville, Barr, Dunn, Freeman, Doak, Dunlap, Janvier, Todd, Latta, Jones, and other clergymen who were resolutely opposed to the licensure of a Hopkinsian; deeming it desirable that all such candidates should be immediately connected with men of their own opinions. Before this Presbytery Mr. Cox read a part of his trials, in which he maintained that God is the efficient cause of every sin. The presbytery after calling in Mr. Cox and examining him, that he might explain his own writing, refused to sustain his doctrines. The Rev. Dr. James P. Wilson, was appointed to express the determination of the presbytery to Mr. Cox, and exhort him to review with candour his own opinions; which was immediately done before the judicatory. Dr. Wilson is claimed by both the Calvinists and the Hopkinsians; and the latter have boasted that he would be with them in the General Assembly; but we know that he has frequently given the northern divinity a severe castigation from the pulpit, and in his reproof of Mr. Cox, explicitly stated, that he would not consent to license any man who held such opinions as those which the young man had exhibited. The Doctor has never pledged himself to the public in any writings on the Hopkinsian controversy. In an edition of Ridgely lately published, he appends many notes, selected from the New England divines, but he does not give them as his views.

Though the presbytery would have refused to license Mr. Cox, yet at a meeting when only a few were present, they gave him a regular transmission to the presbytery of New York, by which he was licensed not long after his arrival there.

Apprehending that there was too much reason to fear the introduction of heresy into their bounds, the synod of Philadelphia, at its sessions in the autumn of 1816, thought proper to warn the churches under its care against the growing evils in our land, in a manner that could not be misunderstood. They issued a pastoral letter, the principal

part of which we shall introduce for the benefit of other churches and posterity.

" Christian Brethren,

" The synod, assembled at Lancaster, at the present time, consists of a greater number of members than have been convened at any meeting for many years; and from their free conversation on the state of religion, it appears, that all the Presbyteries are more than commonly alive to the importance of contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints; and of resisting the introduction of Arian, Socinian, Arminian, and Hopkinsian heresies, which are some of the means by which the enemy of souls would, if possible, deceive the very elect.

" The synod desire to cherish a stronger regard for the truth, as it is in Jesus, than they find at present subsisting among themselves; and because they are not ignorant of the disposition of many good men to cry "peace," where there should be no peace, and "there is no danger," in cases in which God commands us to avoid the appearance of evil; they would affectionately exhort the presbyteries under their care, to be strict in the examination of candidates, for licensure or ordination, upon the subject of those delusions of the present age, which seem to be a combination of most of the innovations made upon Christian doctrine in former times.

" May the time never come, in which our ecclesiastical courts shall determine, that Hopkinsianism, and the doctrines of our Confession of Faith are the same thing; or that men are less exposed now, than in the days of the apostles, to the danger of perverting the right ways of the Lord.

" The synod would exhort particularly the elders of the churches to beware of those, who have made such pretended discoveries in Christian theology as require an abandonment of the form of sound words, contained in our excellent Confession of Faith, and the Holy Scriptures.

"We know of but one anti-trinitarian synagogue in all our borders; and that there may never be another, we pray you, brethren, repeatedly to declare the truth, that the only true God in existence, is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the God who is in Christ Jesus reconciling the world to himself.

Signed by order of the Synod,

JAMES SNODGRASS, Moderator.

Lancaster, Sept. 20, 1816.

"Ordered, that the foregoing letter be printed, and sent to each minister of the synod, to be read in the churches.

(Signed) STEPHEN BOYER,
Stated Clerk."

This paper, which was drafted by Mr. Ely, is an invaluable document, as containing a faithful testimony on behalf of important doctrines and against prevailing heresies; as expressive not only of decided opposition to Hopkinsianism, but of a belief that those who maintain the errors embraced in that term ought not to be permitted to enter on the Christian ministry, at any rate within the presbyterian church. Since the publication of the synodical letter, heresy has not been able to make any inroads into the bounds of the presbytery; and, indeed, what little existed in it, has for more than a year been resisted with vigour. The present state of this central and powerful judicatory, (inferior to none unless it be that of New Castle,) is more favourable than it has been for several years; for Mr. Reeve, the only minister, unless it be the clergyman of colour, the Rev. John Gloucester, who has ever avowed himself to be a Hopkinsian, has lately been dismissed from his people and the presbytery. The general state of the city of Philadelphia too, has lately become more propitious in its aspect towards the true doctrine of the atonement; for in the place once occupied by the Rev. James K. Burch, we now have the pleasure of seeing the Rev. Jacob Brodhead, D. D. who is animated in defence of the doctrines which we love. The Rev. Mr.

Parker, a judicious man, a chaste writer, and a divine of the same stamp, has lately been installed pastor of the Second Reformed Dutch Church, which was formerly the Independent Tabernacle. Mr. M'Cartee, a young man of considerable promise, from Dr. Mason's school, is also soon to be constituted the pastor of the Associate Reformed Church; and the Associate Church has lately received the Rev. Dr. Banks, a Scotch divine of unquestionable orthodoxy, famous for his Hebrew science; and one who in oriental literature is inferior only to the Rev. Samuel B. Wylie, D. D. Pastor of the Reformed Presbyterians in the city. Of two of the Baptist brethren, also, the Rev. Drs. Holcombe and Rogers, we may say that their influence is all exerted in favour of the ancient Calvinism: and concerning the Rev. Dr. Staughton, who is we apprehend sound himself, we have only to regret that he gives his name to Mr. Luther Rice, a Hopkinsian itinerant, who long delays his promised return to India. We ought not to omit the fact that the opposition made against Mr. Ely by the Hopkinsians, has been overruled for good: for it occasioned the erection of a sixth Presbyterian Church, of which the Rev. William Neill, D. D. is now pastor. He increases the strength of Calvinism in Philadelphia.

The "anti-trinitarian synagogue," to which the synod alludes in the pastoral letter, is a Unitarian or Socinian convocation in the city of Philadelphia. Though Dr. Priestley resided in Pennsylvania, yet with all his efforts, there has never been erected in the state any Socinian church, except this one. The doctor wrote an Ecclesiastical History, and his object was the propagation of those heresies for which he was an advocate; but his "Corruptions" have never been much read, and will never do much harm, because a great portion of his facts are not authenticated. He also published a small work, in which he compares the character of Christ Jesus with that of Socrates, evidently designed to elevate the character of the latter, and degrade from all pretensions to divinity that of the former. The Rev. Dr. Linn, late pastor of the First Presbyterian church in Phila-

delphia, replied to Priestley's Comparison, with great force of argument; in doing which he vindicated the Calvinistic doctrine of the atonement. Priestley died in the belief of those heresies, to the propagation of which, the principal part of his life had been devoted. Shortly before his death he called his friends around him and bid them farewel, saying that he was about to take a long sleep; thus with his last breath declaring his belief that his soul would remain in a state of unconscious inactivity, until the resurrection. He left few disciples behind him in Pennsylvania. Boston was the field which he cultivated with success, and the churches of Massachusetts are reaping abundantly the bitter fruits of his labours. The Boston clergy do not depart from the sin wherewith Priestley made them to sin. They gradually sapped the foundations of gospel truth, by mining, and are successful; while the few disciples of Priestley in Pennsylvania, honestly avow their creed and fail. As the personal efforts of this Socinian doctor did little in the state in which he lived, so his name affords little aid to his followers, for most of his works, as well as the greater part of the philosophical opinions peculiar to them, are rapidly descending after him into the grave.

Had the Pennsylvania Socinians asked less at first, they would have succeeded better. Nearly all professors of religion are as much shocked at the principles which the Unitarians avow, as they would be with the most downright deism. Hence it has happened, that though influenced by the principle of curiosity, many people occasionally attended their church for some time after it was opened, yet their hearers now are few; except when they are visited by some learned and popular preacher from the north. Their efforts would be much more successful would they confine themselves to the Hopkinsian part of their system. They and the Hopkinsians united in attacking the pastoral letter of the synod. It is indeed remarkable that we find these parties so often together in the same array. They both assailed Ely's Contrast too, and which with the greatest severity, is doubtful.

Much more is doing for them by their neighbours in the presbytery of Jersey than they are doing for themselves.

A great majority of the ministers of that judicatory have embraced some of the northern errors. The most distinguished of these are the Rev. Dr. Griffin and the Rev. Dr. Richards. In proof of their Hopkinsianism we might quote their publications. Like their brethren in other sections of the church, the Hopkinsians of the presbytery of Jersey use their utmost efforts for the propagation of their peculiar tenets. However amiable, pious and respectable many of these gentlemen may be, the cause of truth demands, that history should speak out with plainness, and that the friends of orthodoxy should know who are for them and who against them. With all their industry, however, there is good reason to hope that they will not ultimately prevail in this state. Here there are antidotes—the theological seminaries of New Brunswick and Princeton, the former under the care of the Reformed Dutch Church, the latter, under that of the General Assembly. There is too, even in the presbytery of Jersey, a good degree of orthodoxy in the ruling elders; for not long since they united with the Rev. John M'Dowell in sustaining a trial piece of Mr. Shepherd Kollock, who advocated the definite atonement, while the majority of the ministers refused to sustain it, for that very reason.

It appears on the minutes of the acts and proceedings of the general Synod of the reformed Dutch church, published in 1800, that the subject of establishing a theological seminary had, for some time previous to that date, been in agitation, and that the synod recommended it to their people to make contributions for that object. Long before that time, indeed, the education of their youth for the ministry, had been under the direction of the general synod. In 1807 a plan for the formation of a theological institution, in connection with Queen's college, at New Brunswick, was laid before that body, by the particular synod of New York, and approved. As that college was peculiarly the property of the Dutch church, this plan met with general approbation,

and measures were taken to raise funds, which were to be entirely appropriated to the education of young men for the ministry. It was encouraged too, by the trustees of Queen's college, in which tuition had been for some time suspended. In order to raise a fund to endow a theological professorate, a collection was to be taken up in every Dutch church some time in the year 1808, and the number of the superintendants of the theological institution was fixed at nine. The college was immediately revived, but the theological department was not opened until the autumn of 1810, when the Rev. Dr. Livingston, mentioned in a former part of this sketch, commenced his course of instructions in divinity with five pupils. In the following year the number was augmented to nine.

To the general synod during their sessions of 1812, a plan of the theological school, was exhibited, in which it is required, that three years shall be the time occupied in the course of study, that the vacations shall not exceed three months in the year; that "every student upon admission to the theological school, shall produce a certificate of his membership in some regular protestant church, and testimonials of his academical attainments,"—and that "students shall be taught natural, didactic, polemic, and practical theology; biblical criticism, chronology, and ecclesiastical history; the form and administration of church government, and pastoral duties, and be able to read the scriptures fluently in the original languages." Four years is the term of study in the school of the associate reformed church in New York, but their sessions continue only during six or seven months in each year.

A considerable number of the young men in the Dutch church, who have devoted themselves to the ministry, have studied in the school under Dr. Mason, and a course in that seminary was for a time considered by the Dutch church as satisfactory. The whole force of the New Brunswick, and New-York seminaries, is employed in advancing the cause of truth. Queen's college itself has lately become subservient to the theological institution, so far that the

youth are to be considered as preparing for the ministry from their first entry into it. The eminent character of Dr. Livingston, for learning, theology and piety, are highly auspicious to the interests of orthodoxy not only in the state of New Jersey, but in the Dutch church generally, and the church at large. The number of students in this seminary on the 28th of May 1816, was fourteen; five of whom were of three years standing; five of two; and four of one. Didactic theology is at present their forte; and the church has reason to expect from this seminary sound and well instructed defenders of the faith. Yet it must be esteemed an inauspicious feature in the character of our country, that, while the schools of medicine, and the offices of gentlemen of the bar are crowded with pupils, a wealthy and powerful society, consisting of more than one hundred and sixty congregations, numbers in its theological school, under such professors as Dr. Livingston, and Dr. Schureman, no more than fourteen students, though the seminary has been eight years in operation. This divinity college would not supply more than five students per annum to the Dutch church, or one hundred and twenty-five, in twenty-five years; in which time, by natural increase, without making any proselytes, they will probably double their number, and require three hundred and twenty ministers, for very few of those who are now employed in the work of the ministry can be expected to be capable, at that time, of performing pastoral duty, should they be then living.

The theological seminary of the general assembly was founded in 1811, under the care of twenty-one ministers, and nine elders, as directors. The seminaries of the Dutch and associate reformed churches, stimulated the assembly to make an effort to found a similar institution. In 1805, it was recommended by that body, to the presbyteries, under its care, to attend especially to the education of young men for the ministry; and at that date they seemed to think the formation of a divinity school for the whole of their church ineligible. Except a department of Princeton college, and one at Canonsburgh, there were never before that time

any theological schools in this church; and the greater part of their sons of the prophets was educated privately by their ministers. Hence the want of unity and energy which characterized their ecclesiastical organization, was every year becoming more apparent. The recommendation to the presbyteries produced little effect.

To the sessions of the general assembly in the following year, a letter was presented from the faculty of Princeton college signed by the president, the Rev. Samuel S. Smith, D. D. exhibiting the advantages for theological improvement, presented at that seminary. The object of this letter was plainly to prepare the way for other propositions relative to the establishment of a general institution for the whole church, and its location at Princeton. The ministers of the general assembly now began to be sensible that the public interests of religion demanded that something should be done to the purpose, by a general exertion of their whole strength; and in 1809, a proposition was laid before the assembly for the formation of a theological seminary, which should concentre and combine the influence of the whole. The presbyteries were ordered to report to the next assembly their views of the subject; and a committee was appointed to draft a plan, to be presented at the same time.

In 1810, the business came fully before them, and the report of the committee contained a plan, which was amended and adopted. The superintendents were appointed, and ordered to meet on the last Tuesday of June, of the same year, at Princeton; where they had resolved to locate their school. The course of study is a liberal one. It prescribes that, "every student, at the close of his course, must have made the following attainments, viz. He must be well skilled in the original languages of the holy scriptures. He must be able to explain the principal difficulties, which arise in the perusal of the scriptures, either from erroneous translations, apparent inconsistencies, real obscurities, or objections arising from history, reason, or argument. He must be versed in the Jewish antiquities, which serve to illustrate and explain the scriptures. He must have an acquaintance

with ancient geography, and with oriental customs, which throw light upon the sacred records.—Thus he will have laid the foundation for becoming a sound biblical critic.

"He must have read and digested the principal arguments and writings, relative to what has been called the deistical controversy.—Thus he will qualified to become a defender of the Christian faith.

"He must be able to support the doctrines of the confession of faith and catechisms, by a ready, pertinent, and abundant quotation of scripture texts for that purpose. He must have studied carefully, and correctly, natural, didactic, polemic, and casuistic theology. He must have a considerable acquaintance with general history and chronology, and a particular acquaintance with the history of the Christian church.—Thus he will be preparing to become an able and sound divine and casuist.

"He must have read a considerable number of the best practical writers on the subject of religion. He must have learned to compose with correctness and readiness, in his own language, and to deliver what he has composed to others in a natural, and acceptable manner. He must be well instructed with the several parts, and the proper structure of popular lectures and sermons. He must have composed at least two lectures, and four popular sermons, that shall have been approved by the professors. He must have carefully studied the duties of the pastoral care.—Thus he will be prepared to become a useful preacher and a faithful pastor.

"He must have studied attentively the form of church government authorized by the scriptures, and the administration of it as it has taken place in the protestant churches."

To carry this system into operation, the Rev. Dr. Archibald Alexander, was chosen professor of theology. This gentleman had been principal of Hampden Sidney college, and was then pastor of the church in Pine street, in which the Rev. Ezra Stiles Ely, is now his successor. Dr. Alexander is a genuine disciple of Calvin and Calvin's master; and indeed it is impossible that he should be otherwise and

be an honest man; for the professors of the seminary, by its constitution are bound by the following oath, and profession:—"In the presence of God, and of the directors of this seminary, I do solemnly, and *ex animo* adopt, receive, and subscribe the confession of faith and catechisms of the presbyterian church in the United States of America, as the confession of my faith; as a summary and just exhibition of that system of doctrine and religious belief which is contained in the holy scripture, and therein revealed by God to man for his salvation: and I do solemnly *ex animo* profess to receive the form of government of said church, as agreeable to the inspired oracles. And I do solemnly promise and engage not to inculcate, teach, or insinuate, any thing which shall appear to me to contradict or contravene, either directly, or impliedly, any thing taught in the said confession and catechisms, nor oppose any of the fundamental principles of presbyterian church government, while I continue a professor in this seminary."

The Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, whose name has been before mentioned, is professor of ecclesiastical history and church government. For his orthodoxy which is unequivocal, he has lately been violently attacked by the pamphleteers of the Hopkinsian school in New York. No degree of moderation, no amiableness of character, no reputation, however well earned, nor any respectability of attainments can shield from their attacks, those who do not adopt the dogmas of these gentlemen. But the reputation of the professors, as scholars and divines, stands on a foundation not to be shaken by the missiles of such forces, as those arrayed against them.

The text book in theology adopted in this school of the prophets is Turrettin, whose character in relation to orthodoxy, has been before drawn, and which the reader will have an opportunity of appreciating from the translations contained in the following pages. This circumstance places in the strongest light, the opinions of our professors, and secures, as far as human means can secure the alumni of the institution from the contamination of Hopkinsian, Ar-

minism and other heresies. This establishment forms a barrier against the progress of those errors in New-Jersey, and their inroads upon the churches of the middle states, from the north; and is calculated to infuse a desirable vigour into the counsels of the church, which has erected it.

The leading traits in the character of the pupils of this school, are warmth of piety and a missionary spirit. It is surprising, however, that attention to the philosophy of mind forms no part of the course of study prescribed. To combat effectually the advocates of the prevalent mistakes of the times, we must be armed with those weapons, which they profess to wield with such dexterity. They must be met on their own ground, and vanquished there; and trophies must be erected over them on those territories which they claim, as almost exclusively their own. It is known, however, that Dr. Alexander does not neglect to initiate, in his lectures, the pupils into the first principles of this important science.

As to the supply of this church with ministers, the remarks which we have made respecting the Dutch church, may be applied. There are in the church under the care of the General Assembly, five hundred and twenty ministers, and upwards of five hundred and fifty congregations, which in twenty-five years more, will amount, by natural increase, to eleven hundred congregations. In the Princeton seminary there are forty-six pupils; which number, as the term of study is three years, will supply fifteen ministers per annum, or three hundred and seventy-five in twenty-five years. Allowing that as many more should be educated privately, there would still be a deficiency of three hundred and fifty. Could we hope, however, that all the ministers, hereafter to be introduced into this branch of the church, would be orthodox, the interests of truth would rapidly improve. This we are not permitted to expect. On the state of orthodoxy, in New-Jersey, this school must have a favourable influence. The Presbytery of New-Brunswick, are said to be all anti-Hopkinsian, while in the Presbytery of Jersey, as we have already stated, the case is otherwise; and from their activi-

ty, and the supineness of the friends of truth, the weight of this majority must increase.

The synod of New-York, is now in a great state of fermentation, and Hopkinsianism is gaining ground. The disciples of the northern school have seven ministers in the New-York Presbytery, and the orthodox five; their influence in the capital of the state must tend to advance it. The Presbytery of Albany have a majority of the Calvinistic creed. Emigrations from the New-England states increase the relative forces, favourably to error, in the western parts of the state. Hence, though there may be, and probably is a majority of orthodox members in the synod of Albany, it cannot be expected to continue so for many years.

The Associate Reformed Seminary, and the influence of Dr. M'Leod's lectures and publications, may be considered as auxiliary to the cause of truth, in the Synod of New-York and New-Jersey. In the seminary under Dr. Mason's care, there are twenty-five alumni, some of whom may be expected to fall into this synod. Indeed there are some of the young men, in this institution, now in connection with the General Assembly.

Dr. Romeyn's character, popularity, and writings, arranged as they always have been, on the side of truth, are equal to a very considerable numerical force on the other side. This gentleman was educated in Schenectady and New-York, and was originally a member of the Reformed Dutch church. He afterwards joined the General Assembly. His labours in the congregation, in which he is placed in New-York, have been greatly blessed. He has lately published two volumes of valuable sermons, which are orthodox of course.

A minister of the Reformed Presbyterian church, the Rev. Gilbert M'Master, settled in the pastoral charge of a congregation at Galway, has published a valuable essay on the doctrine of the atonement, in which he combats the errors of Dr. Hopkins and his followers. This book is well written, and it is extensively read in the state of New-York. He has also published an Analysis of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, designed as a manual for the instruction

of young people. These valuable works of Mr. M'Master, have a tendency to strengthen the hands of the orthodox in the Synods of Albany and of New-York.

Dr. M'Leod has lately published a volume of Sermons, entitled "True Godliness," which though, like those of Dr. Romeyn, not of a controversial character, but designed for the promotion of holiness, by the direct inculcation of gospel truth, nevertheless strike at the root of the prevalent heresies. These works have not been permitted to pass without attack. A series of anonymous essays entitled "*The Triangle*," are now publishing in New-York, in which the most virulent attacks are made upon Dr. Mason, Dr. M'Leod, Dr. Romeyn, Dr. Milledoler, Dr. Miller, Mr. Ely, and others. Its pages are replete with all the Hopkinsian peculiarities, not excepting their high pretensions to metaphysical reasoning, and the style in which they are conveyed to the public, dishonourable to the Christian name, so far as any thing in that way may be esteemed dishonourable to that holy appellation. Men have a taste for what is personally abusive, and love a well told falsehood; all are curious; many are fond of errors; and the friends of truth wish to know what its enemies are doing; hence this work is read by hundreds. In the revivals of religion, as they call them, the clergy who are of the northern school, put this most unchristian and indecent publication into the hands of those who have their passions and feelings excited by their pulpit exhibitions. Such are the ways of error, and the means by which it diffuses among the unwary, its malignant influence.

A question of great magnitude now presents itself: should the friends of orthodoxy, in the General Assembly, bring the Hopkinsian question to a speedy decision, even supposing that they were to calculate merely as human politicians. It is abundantly manifest, that their Confession of Faith, and Catechisms, with all the solemn promises that young men make to adhere to them at their ordination, do not form an effectual barrier against the assailing foe. It is truly deplorable, that men of whom we would fondly entertain a favourable opinion, do not hesitate to swear a belief in those instru-

ments, while they hold and teach opinions, hostile to both their spirit and letter. But we have daily evidence that they do so. However they may satisfy their consciences, by the help of subtle distinctions, and forced explanations, this affords no relief to the friends of gospel truth. Error spreads, and the great interests of the Redeemer's kingdom are compromitted. Gentle measures have been tried and have failed.

It may be thought the theological seminary will correct the evil, and no doubt it will counteract the operations of errorists; but its progress will be slow; and it is even possible the Hopkinsians may obtain its direction, for an unwise policy called peaceful, has already given Mr. Spring, Dr. Richards, and Mr. Hillyer, a seat in the board. In twenty years, it will not, without a very great increase, supply more than three hundred ministers; and twenty years ago there was scarcely one Hopkinsian, in the bounds of the assembly. Will not the same causes, which have lately multiplied them, continue to operate? The churches in the north are generally supplied with ministers, and when the young men of Andover complete their studies, and seek for settlements, they travel to the south, where there are numerous vacancies. Their settlement is not merely a numerical increase of the forces, on the side of error; they are active in making proselytes, and though few of the old clergy embrace Hopkinsianism, yet the minds of the young, whose knowledge of polemical theology is limited, become, in many cases, enamoured with specious subtilties, which are mistaken for solid reasoning.

By being long habituated to philosophy falsely so called, we often come to regard with indifference, opinions which at first shocked every Christian feeling. It was thus that the whole of the Reformed church, in France, became gradually corrupted, its foundations sapped, and its ruin finally completed. The events which took place, in that church, hold up to all posterity an example that false doctrines should not be treated with compassion or lenity, when first introduced; otherwise they will gain possession of the garden of the Lord, and, by their noxious shade blast and wither, if

not the trunk, at least the leaves, fruit, and limbs of the trees of righteousness. There is indeed no tyranny in America, such as that which crushed the church in France, but the Head of the church never can want instruments to punish those particular sections, which by a relaxation of discipline invite an invasion from Satan's kingdom of darkness. The question must come to decision. The day of the church's glory approaches, and the Redeemer will not permit the wound of the daughter of his people to be healed slightly. "Error must be grubbed up by the roots." Let the pulpit, the press, and church discipline unite at once in contending for the faith, and the strong holds of error will be battered down. Light must dissipate the darkness.

The ecclesiastical intercourse which subsists between the General Assembly and the Eastern General Associations has now become a matter of regret; because the delegates from the Associations are congregationalists, and therefore cannot be very well qualified to judge about questions of presbyterial order: and because the ministers whom they represent, however Calvinistic some of them may be in other respects, with almost a perfect unanimity reject the doctrine of an atonement exclusively for the elect. The number of delegates which Vermont, Massachusetts, New-Hampshire and Connecticut may send to vote and determine in all matters is twelve, of whom eight or nine are commonly present. This is a greater number than is frequently present from some of the distant synods that belong to the assembly. Were they like visiters from a neighbouring family, to advise and maintain social intercourse, without interfering in the government of the family by a vote, the relation would be less objectionable. It may be said, that the Delegates from the General Assembly enjoy an equal representation and influence in the Congregational Associations: it is true: but in either case it is indelicate and improper for persons of different sentiments about government and discipline to interfere with each others family regulations. The door should not be kept open by the Assembly for the introduction of teachers and principles which have

a tendency to disorganize and distract the churches under its care. It may may seem unwarrantable to declare, that this clerical intercourse ultimately embraces the Arians, and Socinians; but it really does, for the members of the General Association of Massachusets belong to the Convention of ministers, that annually assemble in Boston; and so the association becomes a link in the chain which connects the Convention, at which a Socinian often presides and preaches, with the General Assembly. The Association is the middle person of three, who have joined hands, that the electrical fluid of heresy may be conveyed through them all, from the grand battery in New-England.

No such union as that which we have described exists between any of the other Presbyterian bodies in the middle states and the northern associations. Until lately, the Associate Reformed synod have had no ecclesiastical connection with any other denomination, in America. Various propositions have lately been made for forming a connection between it and the Reformed Dutch church; and many of its ministers and people partake of the sacrament of the supper in the congregations of that body, as well as of the General Assembly. Dr. Mason was the first who introduced this intercommunion. His congregation and that of Dr. Romeyn sat down to the sacrament together. For this departure from their established order, Dr. Mason's conduct was investigated before the Associate Reformed synod at various sessions, many of whose members were warmly opposed to such intercommunion. The principal opposition was from the western and southern clergy, who were so much dissatisfied that they withdrew their support from the theological seminary, over which the Doctor presides. What they contributed to its funds did not perhaps exceed the contributions of Dr. Mason's congregation. The affair was never brought to a decision, and had it been, Dr. Mason would probably have been victorious; for most of the ministers, who had received their education in New-York, entered into the views of the professor. The peace of that branch of the church has been disturbed, and almost

destroyed; and harmony in their counsels has disappeared. In vindication of the course which he had taken Dr. Mason has published a book, which he entitles "Catholic Communion," the object of which is to prove that any Presbyterian who is known to any session as a creditable professor of faith in Christ in any denomination, ought not to be refused occasional communion in celebrating the Lord's supper, by the church under the care of said session.

The repose of this church too has been disturbed in many instances, by a synodical permission to any church to use the Dutch psalmody in their congregational devotions. The act by which this permission was given, passed the synod in 1816, at its sessions, in Philadelphia; and appears to have had for its object a union with the Reformed Dutch church. The result of all these measures has been, that the Associate Reformed church draws near to its dissolution, and will ere long be merged, partly in the general assembly, partly in the Dutch, partly in the Antiburgher, and partly in the Reformed church. Mr. Matthews, the assistant professor, is already pastor of a Dutch church, the Rev. Arthur Stansbury has joined the general assembly, and is settled in a congregation in Albany; and others of them have joined other churches. Hence, though the synod consists of upwards of sixty ministers, all orthodox, yet its influence in advancing the cause of truth is rather to be estimated from the effect which its members will produce in other relations which they may form, than from their own combined energies.

There has been one instance in this connection of a minister's embracing the Hopkinsian doctrines;—the Rev. Mr. M'Chord, of Kentucky. This gentleman entered into Dr. Mason's views of catholic communion, and received the sacrament of the supper from the hands of a Presbyterian minister in Lexington. He was aware that many of his brethren were exceedingly opposed to this measure, and he wrote a number of essays on the body of Christ, which he published in the Evangelical Record, a magazine edited in Lexington. These essays he afterwards printed in a volume,

with some abridgments and enlargements. He did not confine himself to the subject of Catholic communion, but pushed his enquiries into the nature of the covenant of grace and the covenant of works; and introduced various new views, on these constitutions. He maintains that the covenant of works was made with Adam for himself, and so formed that, as his posterity actually come into existence, they are embraced in it, but that it contemplates no definite number. The covenant of grace he considers in the same light, as embracing no one until he comes into existence. On these points he goes extensively into detail, and manifests no small degree of intellectual vigour in the discussion. For the errors, which his book contains, he was brought to trial before the presbytery, and suspended from the exercise of the ministerial office; he appealed to the synod; but on account of his absence, the business did not issue in a regular trial of the appeal. Upon the whole, his system is perhaps no more than a new modification, or a new manner of exhibiting the Hopkinsian opposition to any such imputation and representation as would make it appear that all men sinned in Adam, and that all believers suffered and obeyed in Christ Jesus.

One of the bodies, from which the associate reformed synod originated, the Antiburghers or Associate church, has been visited too with these errors. The Rev. Mr. Duncan, one of its members, published a book, in which he denies that the righteousness of Christ is transferred to us; that is, that it is not imputed to us for our justification. He also was suspended for this Hopkinsian aberration; but with some explanations and resantations, he was again restored to his office. This denomination has grown to a considerable size, and has upwards of fifty ministers. With the exception of the doctrine of the civil magistrate's power relative to ecclesiastical affairs, the associate synod adheres to the Westminster confession. They have not altered its letter even on this point, but they receive it with an explanation, or rather a rejection of it, in an exhibition of their principles, which they style, "An Act and Testi-

mony." They have a theological school established in Washington county, Pennsylvania, under the care of the Rev. Dr. John Anderson, their professor, a sound divine, and very pious man. He is from Scotland; and has published several books, among which is one entitled *Vindicæ Cantus*, or a vindication of scriptural psalmody; the object of which is to prove, that no other than divine songs should be used in devotion. The associate Presbyterians use none other, and this constitutes almost the only distinction, between them, and the associate reformed church, except that they are in connection with the Antiburgher synod of Scotland and Ireland, while the latter are connected with the Burghers in those kingdoms. All their influence in this church will be on the side of orthodoxy. They have neither ecclesiastical nor sacramental intercommunion with other denominations. On the subject of faith, there have been warm disputes between the ministers of this body, and those of the general assembly; for the former maintain that assurance of grace, and salvation enter into its nature, while their antagonists deny it. They are generally a pious people, and do not mingle with the world. They profess also a high respect for the covenants that were entered into in Great Britain, between the people and Almighty God.

There has lately sprung up in the west another denomination, who style themselves Reformed Dissenters, and who arose out of a secession from the associate reformed church. The latter body in accommodating their ecclesiastical system to the civil constitutions of the country, made alterations in the Westminster Confession of Faith, in those parts of it, which treat of the power of the civil magistrate in calling ecclesiastical councils. In consequence of these alterations, two ministers, the Rev. Alexander M'Coy and the Rev. Robert Warwick, seceded from them; and with their ruling elders formed a presbytery. This body has exhibited a view of its principles and a testimony against errors, which is published in a large pamphlet. Their principles are the same with those of the Westminster divines.

The reformed Presbyterians, or Covenanters, in America, adhere precisely to the creed of their brethren in Great

Britain. Their synod was constituted in Philadelphia, in 1809, before which time they had existed as a presbytery, and their principles are exhibited in a book entitled, "Reformation Principles," in which they testify, in the most explicit manner, against the Hopkinsian errors. Like that of the reformed Dutch church, this creed has never been changed. They are distinguished from all other presbyterians, by their doctrines on civil government. Adopting the principles embraced in the national covenant of Scotland, and in the Solemn League and Covenant, they hold themselves bound to testify against every government in a Christian country that will not acknowledge explicitly the headship of Messiah over the nations, and the Bible as the standard of civil legislation; hence they disapprove of the federal constitution, in which there is no allegiance acknowledged to the government of God, and they admit none to church privileges who will not join with them in the testimony, and in acknowledgment of the principles contained in the British covenants. They also disapprove of that part of the constitution, which admits atheists and deists to the occupation of civil offices. The calling of conventions of ministers (as the state of Connecticut called the convention which formed the Saybrook Platform) for consultation, they believe to be calculated for the promotion of the interests of truth, and the welfare of a nation. In this manner they contend that every nation in its civil capacity should subserve the moral, spiritual, and ecclesiastical interests of men, and the glory of God.

With such principles and great strictness of practice, not admitting any to baptism for their children, nor to the Lord's Supper, who do not practice statedly family devotion, and acknowledge their creed, it would at first sight seem that their increase must be very slow. They have, however, increased with great rapidity, notwithstanding the unpopularity of many of their principles, and strict practices. In the year 1800, they had not more than three organized congregations in America, and they have now twenty preachers and nearly forty congregations. The Rev. John Black, of

this church, was settled in Pittsburgh in 1801, and though when he first visited that country, not long before, there were not more than five families of the denomination, yet there are now four settled ministers in Pennsylvania, west of the mountains, and numerous vacancies.

They have also established a theological school, which is located in Philadelphia. Measures were taken for this object in 1807, at the session of the Reformed Presbytery in Franklin county, Pennsylvania; and the Rev. (now Dr.) Samuel B. Wylie was appointed professor of theology. Dr. Wylie was educated at Glasgow college, in which he received the first honour, in a class of one hundred. Soon after he graduated, he emigrated to America, and was for some time employed as a teacher in the University of Pennsylvania. After he was licensed to preach the gospel, he travelled as a missionary from the state of Vermont to South Carolina, both through the western and Atlantic states, and was instrumental in organizing congregations and societies. He accepted a call from a congregation in Philadelphia, but before he entered on his pastoral care, returned to Glasgow, and heard the lectures of one season. Soon after his return to Philadelphia, he was made a professor of languages in the university of Pennsylvania, in which station he continued for several years. His knowledge of the oriental and several modern languages, of philosophy and divinity, is accurate and extensive. He has heard nearly all the lectures delivered in the medical school in Philadelphia.

In the autumn of 1810, this theological school was opened. Several young men, educated in this institution, have been ordained to the ministry, and settled in pastoral charges. It requires four winters to complete the course. Peculiar attention is paid to metaphysics, belles lettres, sacred history, and Hebrew, during the first two winters. The last two winters are chiefly occupied in Biblical criticism and theology. On these subjects the professor delivers extemporaneous lectures. The superintendents of the seminary are the Rev. Dr. M'Leod, the Rev. Messrs. Gibson, Black, and M'Master. The number of young men prosecuting theological

studies during the winter of 1816-17, was ten. The supply of ministers afforded to this church is by no means equal to its increase. The Rev. Mr. Rylie, of the southern presbytery, during the last year, performed a missionary tour of five months, in which time, he organized five congregations, from every one of which he received a call to become its pastor.

All the influence of this seminary is in the orthodox interest; and the acquisitions of the pupils in metaphysics and Biblical criticism, will render them able advocates for the truth, while the habits of the church, to which they belong, will make them willing to enter the lists of controversy.

The four seminaries of the Presbyterian Churches, have their distinctive properties and their peculiar features. That of the Associate Reformed is distinguished for the aptness of its young men to teach, and an imitation of Dr. Mason's eloquence; that of the Reformed Dutch Church, for the acquisitions of its alumni in didactic theology; that of the General Assembly for the zeal, and pastoral qualifications of its sons; and that of the Reformed Presbyterian Church for the attainments of its pupils in metaphysics, composition, and Biblical criticism. Could all these be united, in one institution, and their whole force be brought to bear upon the hosts of heretics, upon the promotion of truth, and the advancement of practical piety, how desirable, how glorious an object would be gained! We may console ourselves, however, with the reflection that all belong to the church of God, are one in principle on the atonement, and all harmonize in their attempts to dissipate the noxious vapours that are diffusing their pestilential influence over the land. Were it asked whether, the present state and prospects of the church, demand rather an affectionate ministry, in whom feeling prevails, or a ministry in whose devotions the intellectual character predominates; it ought to be answered without hesitation, if the frailty of human nature renders it impossible to combine the ardent love of a John with the intellectual power and doctrinal perspicuity of a Paul; let us have Pauls for our ministers. It is the general belief of Christians that

the millennial glory of the church is approaching, "when the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the saints of the Most High." It is vain to expect that such an event shall take place without a great conflict. In all ages of the church, when there has been any great revival, when any great reformation has been effected, it has been by a conflict between truth and error, proportioned in magnitude to the effect produced. How was it that the apostle Paul was made the instrument of Christianizing the Roman empire, and of shaking the throne of the Cesars to its foundations? Doubtless, by his vast powers of reasoning, accompanied by the blessing of God; for when he raises up very learned men, of vast conceptions, and acute habits of reasoning, we may reasonably conclude, that such instruments have been prepared for some valuable purpose. May we not say the same of those men, who were the instruments in the hand of Heaven, of effecting the Reformation from popery? Did not the reasoning powers of Zuinglius, of Luther, of Beza, of Calvin, of Knox, of Du Moulin, &c. preponderate? Then too there was a tremendous conflict of opinions, which agitated the whole world, and excited into action all its intellectual fibres.

The age of controversy has now commenced in the Christian world. Errors of the most destructive nature have been poured upon the church in copious floods, for more than a century, and comparatively little has been done by the friends of truth; but they begin now to awake, and are girding on the harness. A spirit is beginning to be aroused, which nothing can quell. That ministry then who are the most learned, intellectual, polemic and faithful, will be the most successful. While the church then should spare no pains to have a pious, and ardently zealous ministry, let her bend her most vigorous efforts, after she has selected pious candidates, to the cultivation of those characteristics, which the signs of the times peculiarly demand. Let her teach her sons of the prophets to expect, and prepare to enter the field of combat. Let them be taught to imitate an

Owen, a Magee, a Horseley, a Scott, a M'Leod, a Campbell, an Ely, and a M'Master, in polemic divinity.

We have yet another denomination of Presbyterians to review—the German Calvinists. They are chiefly confined to Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland, though they have a few congregations in New York and in Ohio. A few of these people emigrated to Pennsylvania not long after the commencement of settlements in the colony. They derive their origin from the Reformed church in Germany, and hold in high estimation the character of Zuinglius and Luther. The Heidelburgh catechism is the manual which they use for the instruction of their children, and as their standard of divine truth. They have published no statistical tables; but they are known to have between fifty and sixty ministers. The disadvantages under which they have laboured, in relation to schools of literature, and the tenacity with which they adhere to the language of their fathers, nearly all their ministers preaching in the German language, have rendered it impossible for their clergy to become very learned. There is not much education among the laity. Their religious associations have been, until very lately, much confined to their own society. Among them, there exists very considerable diversity of sentiment in relation to the doctrine of divine decrees, the imputation of Adam's sin, the impotency of human nature, and the extent of the atonement. Some of them embrace precisely the doctrines of the Genevan school; they are, however, the minor number. The greater part of them are Arminians, and some are suspected of Socinianism; but as a body, they are opposed to this heresy. It is on this ground that they refuse to admit to their communion, and to associate among them as ministers, emigrants from the reformed churches in Germany, until they have submitted to an examination, as to their soundness in the faith; for the general mass of ministers in Germany has been found tainted with Socinianism.

They have for many years contemplated the formation of a theological school, under the patronage of their synod, but they have not yet been able to effect it. Their young

men now generally prosecute their theological studies under the care of the Rev. Dr. Helfenstein, of Philadelphia; who teaches them Latin, Greek, Hebrew, German, and theology. The number of their students rarely exceeds ten. The increase of this society is not rapid; one great cause of which is, that they preach chiefly in German, while that language is going into disuse, and must ere long be cultivated by very few people in America. Many of their ministers are devout, sensible men, and excellent preachers, and many of their people are pious and intelligent.

The Baptist society in the United States is large, increases very rapidly, and is spread over the whole republic. It embraces many men of learning and respectability, and has great weight in some seminaries of learning. Brown university, in the state of Rhode Island, is almost exclusively its property; and the Rev. Dr. Maxcy, who was formerly president of that institution, and now of the South Carolina college, as mentioned above, belongs to the Baptist church. At the beginning of the present century, they had in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont, Rhode Island, New York, Delaware, and South Carolina, 360 congregations, which doubtless, was far from half their number. Their present number of congregations is certainly near eight hundred. During 35 years, in the state of Massachusetts alone, their increase was 62 congregations. By far the greater proportion of the Baptist clergy are illiterate; many of them, especially in the eastern states, or who have originated there, are of the Hopkinsian defection. The northern clergy of this society are generally more learned than their brethren to the south and west. In Philadelphia, great personal efforts are making by the Rev. Dr. Staughton, to improve the state of literature among the Baptist clergy, and by Doctors Holcombe and Rogers, to turn their brethren from the errors of their ways. From five to ten young men are commonly under the care of the former, whom he instructs in geography, composition, grammar, Greek, Hebrew, history, and theology. Many, who have been for some time engaged in preaching, have put themselves under

the doctor's tuition, and preach in the city and its vicinity, while they prosecute their theological studies. The influence of this school is thrown into the orthodox scale. The same missionary spirit which animates the Baptists in Europe, prevails among the American Baptists. There is no single society in the United States that has carried its efforts on this subject so far as they have done. They set an example worthy of universal imitation. Their zeal for making proselytes to their system, is, perhaps, greater than that of any other branch of the church in America, if we except the methodists. It differs from the Hopkinsian spirit in this respect, that they wish to make proselytes, and suffer them to continue in the churches to which they are attached, that with greater facility they may diffuse their errors; whereas, the proselytes to the doctrine of anti-pedobaptism, all unite themselves with the Baptist church.

Next to the Baptists, it is hard to say whether the New England churches or the general assembly have displayed the most of a missionary spirit. The former have established a board of foreign missions, and have several local missionary societies. The general assembly has for a long time had a committee, which was last year enlarged, and clothed with authority to act as a board of missions. They employ many settled pastors and others, in their new settlements, as itinerants for several months in a year. It is a favourable circumstance for the diffusion of the true gospel, that this board meets in Philadelphia, and that the Rev. Jacob J. Janeway, D. D. is its president. He has taken a decided stand in opposition to the indefinite atonement, and all the Hopkinsian innovations; and it may be expected that his influence will be exerted to send forth sound evangelists; and the orthodox only, as the missionaries of the general assembly; while the eastern missionaries are too frequently men, whose talents will procure them no establishment at home; but whose attachment to the New England divinity is obtrusive and unconquerable.

As in Britain, so here many of those whom we number among the baptist congregations are called irregular bap-

tists, the greater part of whom are Arminians. The regular baptists of the middle states generally embrace the system of Dr. Gill, who is much studied and copied by the clergy, and read by the common people. In forming an estimate of the influence which the various denominations will have on the doctrine of the atonement, the balance in this society would, upon the whole, be rather against the orthodox interest. The learning and the talent of the regular baptists are divided between the orthodox and the Hopkinsians, while the Arminians number in their ranks, the irregulars. Here, as in every branch of the church, the grand enemy of truth, the most to be dreaded, because the most insinuating and the most to be opposed, is Hopkinsianism. The irregular baptists, disappear before the light of literature and genuine scientific theology, and with them their delusions, while the northern heresy poisons the very fountains of literature and theology. It is a specious, falsely metaphysical system, that pretends to more than ordinary intelligence and piety. Among the regular baptists, there are much ardent piety, and numerous amiable people.

The Methodist society is numerically a powerful body; its system is well arranged and remarkably vigorous, for the materials of which it is composed. Its purest organization was imparted to it by bishops Coke and Asbury, both of them well acquainted with men, and the means of governing them. The great, as well as the most minute parts of the machinery which they put into operation, are adjusted with wonderful accuracy. They maintain precisely the doctrines that were taught by the Arminians of Holland, and embraced by the English methodists, whom they resemble in all the distinctive features of their character. They scarcely possess any learned men, and they rather despise human literature, than manifest any disposition to cherish and cultivate it. The stock of knowledge, and the themes on which their clergy declaim are soon exhausted, and hence all their preachers are itinerants. They declaim with great vehemence and arouse the passions of their auditors; and even the most ignorant of their preachers possess a

wonderful dexterity in this art. All their proselytes are formed into small bands, placed under the direction of the most active men, who are called class leaders, by whom they are drilled in such a manner, as is thought best calculated to ensure their adherence to the society. Their operations extend from the district of Maine to the Floridas, and from the shores of the Atlantic to the remotest settlements of the west; but they are always most successful in the ruder sections of society. Would God the enlightened presbyterians had half their zeal!

When a learned clergy are planted in those neighbourhoods in which they have flourished, and schools of literature are opened, immediately the methodists begin to decline, and often, in a short time entirely disappear. In Virginia they are powerful. The destruction of the episcopal church, when its civil establishment was broken down, the deficiency of presbyterian clergy, and generally of the means of religious instruction, opened for them a wide field which they have not failed to cultivate with extraordinary assiduity. In the mountainous districts they have been active in their exertions, with very little to counteract their operations. They hang too on the skirts of population to the west, where the state of society verges towards savagism, and have formed numerous societies destined to vanish before the spreading beams of science and knowledge.

They have not, like learned and acute Arminians, advanced into the regions of Arianism, and Socinianism, which they will certainly do, if a spirit of illuminating grace prevent not, so soon as the condition of society forces them to turn their attention to the cultivation of literature. Hence many of them are theoretical Arminians, and practical Calvinists. In their prayers, they acknowledge the impotency of human nature, and seek for the efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit as necessary to their faith and sanctification: and the merits of Christ, as necessary to their justification. Hence many of them must, in consequence of judgment of charity be allowed to be devout in heart, and exemplary

in their lives. It is through want of intellect, and some degree of grace in the heart, that they habitually pray against their own creed, in their petitions to the throne of grace.

The German Lutheran church is a respectable body, as to numbers and wealth, in Pensylvannia and Maryland. The number of their clergy amounts to about fifty, and they have many vacancies. Many of their ministers have been respectable for learning and talents. Among the most conspicuous have been the Rev. Dr. Muhlenburgh of Lancaster in Pennsylvania, and the Rev. Dr. Helmuth of Philadelphia. Dr. Muhlenburgh acquired considerable celebrity, for his botanical knowledge, and various other literary attainments; but his attempts to diffuse a taste for literature among the Lutheran clergy, generally proved unsuccessful. They have never established a theological seminary, and they labour under the same difficulties, which have depressed the German reformed church. Dr. Helmuth has usually had a few young men under his care, some of whom have passed through the colleges. While the German preachers continue to officiate in a foreign language, daily going into disuse, their churches cannot flourish. In order to become learned, the clergy of the German societies must throw their weight into the English seminaries.

Luther's Catechism is the manual which they employ in the instruction of their children; but they are, like the Lutherans of England and Germany, nearly all Arminians.

They all maintain the doctrine of consubstantiation; or that the body and blood of Christ are in, with, and under the sacramental bread and wine; which, together with the episcopal form of their ecclesiastical government, keeps them and the German reformed church, distinct bodies. There is, however, a good understanding between them; and they often officiate in each other's pulpits; and embrace nearly the same views of the doctrines of grace. Both have nearly the same degree of piety and illumination, though the nominal Calvinists are esteemed the more evangelical.

The protestant episcopal church (of England) has probably increased more slowly, than any other denomination of Christians in the United States, in proportion to the number of their emigrants, and their wealth, intelligence, and the efforts which they have made. This has been owing partly to the form of their church government, whose hierarchy does not well accord with the genius of our republican institutions. It is a plan, that was originally modelled after the form of the Roman monarchy, and in monarchies it has always succeeded best. We have no instance of its ever flourishing to any great extent in a republic, and it is probable it never will. The slowness of its growth, has also in part proceeded from the general lukewarmness of its members, in relation to practical piety,—a lukewarmness which the more pious episcopalians always deplore.

Many of its clergy are men of learning and intelligence; many are of an opposite character; and they are all either in whole, or in part, disciples of the Arminian school. We know not a man among them all in America, who maintains a definite atonement.

In 1784, in a convention of the clergy and congregations of this church in Pennsylvania, an act was passed, adopting the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, and declaring that the doctrines of the church of England, as then professed, should form the creed of the episcopal church in America. Soon after, in the same year, a similar act was passed by a convention of the whole episcopal church in the United States.

The number of their clergy in 1814, without including those of Virginia, from which there were no returns, was one hundred and seventy-nine. Their vacancies are very numerous. They have probably upwards of two hundred ministers, and near two hundred and fifty congregations. Their efforts to enlarge the boundaries of their church are great; and in this way, bishop Hobart has distinguished his zeal for the promotion of the interests of the church to which he belongs. They build splendid edifices, for places of worship, and endow them with great liberality, which is another

mode in which they exert themselves to increase their numbers. In this way considerable effect has been produced, in the western part of the state of New York, among the emigrants from New England. A minister of the episcopal church goes into a neighbourhood in which there is no church; asks the people how much they will contribute to the erection of one; and proposes to make up the deficiency, provided they will accept of an episcopalian minister. Considering their wealth and activity, we can only account for the slowness of their growth, from the causes before mentioned.

In Pennsylvania, there is a society formed, for the propagation of episcopalianism, the annual contribution of whose members, is sufficient to support two or three missionaries; and with such funds, it must produce considerable effect, where there is a very extensive field to cultivate.

It is surprising that a body, possessing so much political wisdom, and such means, has never concentred its efforts for the formation of a theological school. In 1814, a proposition to that effect, was brought before the convention, but it was negatived. Should such a school be formed, and there can hardly exist a doubt but it will, one of two events will occur. Either the episcopal church will become Socinian, or more friendly to Calvinism. The latter event is more probable; as many of their clergy are latterly becoming more evangelical, and a spirit of practical piety begins to be awakened in some sections of the church. Whitby is recommended to their students of theology, and generally read, and approved. But should a theological school be established, and young men, from various and distant parts of the United States, be brought together, their minds would be expanded; some other books than the effusions of Arminians would fall into their hands; and a spirit of liberal enquiry would be awakened. They would read the works of the early reformers, and the yoke of bigotry, which is now bound on their shoulders, would be shaken off.

There have been very few theological writers in the episcopalian church of America. Bishop White, has lately pub-

lished a small volume entitled "A Comparison between Calvinism and Arminianism." He calls the Calvinistic plan "a gloomy system;" and no doubt it is to all who do not understand it; applauds Whitby, and exerts himself in the promotion of the Arminian system. Generally it is a very mild work as to the manner; just such as we should expect from the amiable man; but highly toned Arminianism in the sentiments which it contains.

Columbia college in New York, and the university of Pennsylvania, are almost exclusively in the hands of this church. The Rev. Dr. Harris, is president of the former, and the Rev. Dr. Beazely, provost of the latter. These are the only important colleges of which they have the chief direction. But the almost entire banishment of every thing like religion from nearly all our colleges, and grammar schools, except morning prayers, renders most of them nearly neutral as to the propagation of any religious creeds. Harvard university and Yale college, form exceptions to this remark. The minds of youth, however, may be expected to receive a tincture from the modes of thought, and the opinions of their teachers.

To conclude this sketch, a very large majority of the professors of religion in the United States, are either Hopkinsians, or entire Arminians, and as such opposed to the doctrine of a definite atonement. The wealth of the nation is in the hands of error; and the learning is pretty equally divided. Piety is on the side of Calvinism, in all cases, though many pious men are erroneous in some of their opinions.

TRANSLATIONS

FROM

FRANCIS TURRETTIN,

ON

THE ATONEMENT.

TRANSLATIONS

FROM

FRANCIS TURRETTIN,

ON

THE ATONEMENT.

CHAPTER I.

On the Necessity of the Atonement.

THE Priesthood of Christ, according to the apostle Paul, and the exhibition made of it, in the Jewish ritual may be divided into two parts, the atonement which he made to divine justice, and his intercession in heaven, 1. Joh. ii. 2. Heb. ix. 12. The necessity of such an atonement, which is the foundation of all practical piety, and all Christian hopes must be firmly established, and defended against the fiery darts of Satan, with which it is attacked by innumerable adversaries.

Respecting the necessity of the atonement, the opinions of divines may be classed under three heads. 1. That of the Socinians, who not only deny that an atonement was made, but affirm that it was not at all necessary, and maintain that God could pardon sin, without any satisfaction made to his justice. 2. That of those who distinguish between an absolute and a hypothetical necessity; and in opposition to the Socinians maintain the latter kind of necessity, while they deny the former. By a hypothetical necessity they mean that which flows from the divine decree.—God has decreed

that an atonement is to be made, therefore it is necessary. To this they also add a necessity of fitness; as the commands of God have been transgressed it is fit that satisfaction should be made, that the transgressor may not pass with impunity. Yet they deny that it was absolutely necessary, as God they say, might have devised some other way of pardon than through the medium of an atonement. This is the ground taken by Augustine in his book on the trinity. Some of the reformers who have written against the Socinians adopt the opinions of that father. 3. That of those who maintain the doctrine of absolute necessity; affirming that God, neither has willed, nor could have willed to forgive sins, without a reparation of the breach of his law, by a satisfaction made to his justice. This is the common opinion of the orthodox. It is our opinion.

Various errors are maintained on this point, by those who deny the doctrine of the atonement. The removal of the grounds upon which they rest will throw light upon the whole of this important subject. They err in their views of the nature of sin, for which a satisfaction is required; of the satisfaction itself; of the character of God to whom it is to be rendered; and of Christ by whom it is rendered.

1. Of sin, which renders us guilty, and binds us over to punishment, as hated of God. It may be viewed as a debt which we are bound to pay to divine justice, in which sense the law is called "a hand writing," Col. ii. 14.—As a principle of enmity, whereby we hate God, and he becomes our enemy—as a crime against the Government of the universe by which, before God, the supreme governor, and judge, we become deserving of everlasting death and malediction. Whence, sinners are expressly called "debtors," (Matt. vi. 12.), "enemies to God," both actively and passively, (Col. i. 21.) "and guilty before God." (Rom. iii. 19.) We, therefore, infer that three things were necessary in order to our redemption—the payment of the debt contracted by sin—the appeasing of the divine wrath, and the expiation of guilt.

2. From the preceding remarks, the nature of the satisfac-

tion, which was to be made for sin, may be easily perceived. That which we are chiefly to attend to in sin is its criminality. Satisfaction has relation to the penalty, which has been enacted against it by the Supreme Judge.

But here we must attend to a two-fold payment, which is noticed by jurists. One which, by the very deed of payment, sets at liberty the debtor, and annuls the obligation, whether the payment is made by the debtor in his own person, or by a surety in his name. Another in which the bare fact of payment is not sufficient to liberate the debtor, which takes place when the payment is not precisely that which is demanded in the obligation, but an equivalent. In this case, though the creditor has a right to refuse the acceptance of such payment, yet he admits it and esteems it a payment, which is entitled a satisfaction. The former of these takes place in a pecuniary, the latter in a penal debt. In a pecuniary transaction, the fact of the payment of the sum due, frees the debtor, by whomsoever the payment is made. Respect here is not had to the person paying, but to the payment only. Whence, the creditor, having been paid the full amount due, is not said to have treated with indulgence the debtor, or to have forgiven the debt. But in penal debt, the case is different. The debt does not regard things but persons. Here we regard not the *thing* paid, so much as the *person* who pays; i. e. that the transgressor may be punished. For as the law demands individual personal obedience, so it demands individual and personal suffering. In order that the guilty person may be released in consequence of an atonement being made by another in his stead, the governor or judge must pass a decree to that effect. That decree or act of the judge is, in relation to the law, called relaxation, and in relation to the debtor, or guilty person, pardon, or remission; for his personal suffering is dispensed with, and in its place a vicarious suffering accepted. But because, in the subject under discussion, sin has not a relation to debt only, but also to punishment, satisfaction is not of that kind, which by the act itself, frees the debtor. To effect this there must be an act of pardon passed by the

Supreme Judge, because that is not precisely paid, i. e. a personal enduring of the penalty, which the law demands, but a vicarious suffering only. Hence we discover how perfectly accordant remission and satisfaction are with each other, notwithstanding the outcry made by the enemy respecting their supposed discrepancy. Christ made the *satisfaction* in his life, and at his death; and God, by accepting this satisfaction paves the way for remission. The satisfaction respects Christ from whom God demands a punishment not numerically but specifically the same which we owed. Pardon respects believers, who are freed from punishment, in their own persons, while a vicarious suffering is accepted. Hence we see how admirably mercy is attempered with justice. Justice is exercised against sin, and mercy towards the sinner—an atonement is made to the divine justice, by a surety and God mercifully pardons us.

3. This reasoning is greatly fortified from a consideration of the relations in which God stands to the sinner. He may be viewed in a threefold relation as the creditor; as the Lord and party offended; and as the judge and ruler. But though both the former relations must be attended to in this matter, yet the third is to be chiefly considered. God here is not merely a creditor, who may at pleasure remit what is his due, nor merely the party offended who may do as he will with his own claims without injury to any one; but he is also a judge and rectoral governor, to whom alone pertains the infliction of punishment upon offenders, and the power of exempting offenders from the penal sanction of the law. This all jurists know belongs to the chief magistrate alone. The creditor may demand his debt, and the party offended reparation for the offence, or indemnity for his loss; but the judge alone has the power to compel payment, or exact punishment. Here, lies the capital error of our adversaries, who maintain that God is to be considered merely in the light of a creditor, and that he is at liberty to exact or remit the punishment at pleasure. It is however certain, that God sustains the character of judge and sovereign of the world, and has the rights of sovereignty to maintain, and

professes himself to be the guardian and avenger of his laws; and hence possesses the claims not only of a creditor which he might assert, or remit at pleasure, but also the right of government, and punishment which is naturally indispensable. We must, however, in the punishment itself distinguish accurately between the enforcing of the penalty, and the manner and circumstances under which it is enforced as they are things widely different. Punishment may be viewed generally; and in this respect the right of Heaven to inflict it is natural; and its claims indispensable, for they are founded in the divine justice. If there be such an attribute as justice, and who will dispute it, belonging to God, then sin must have its due, which is punishment. But as to the manner and circumstances of the punishment, the case is altogether different. They are not essential to that attribute. They are to be arranged according to his will and pleasure. It may seem fit to the goodness of God that there should be, in relation to time, a delay of punishment—in relation to degree, a mitigation of it, and in relation to persons a substition. For although the person sinning deserves punishment and might be punished with the strictest justice, yet such punishment is not necessarily, indispensable. For reasons of great importance, there may be a transfer of the punishment to a surety. In this sense it is said by divines that sin is of necessity punished impersonally, but every sinner is not therefore of necessity to be punished personally. Through the singular mercy of God some may be exempted from punishment, by the substitution of a surety in their stead.

But that we may conceive it possible for God to do this, he must be considered not as an inferior judge appointed by law. An officer of that character, cannot remit any thing of the rigor of the law by transfering the punishment, from the actual offender, to another person. God must be viewed in his true character, as a supreme judge who giveth account of none of his matters, who will satisfy his justice by the punishment of sin, and who, through his infinite wisdom, and unspeakable mercy, determines to do this in such a way

as shall relax somewhat of the extreme rigour of punishment, by admitting a substitute, and letting the sinner go free. Hence we discover to whom the atonement is to be made, whether to the devil, (as Socinus with a sneer, asks) or to God, as sovereign judge? For as the devil is no more than the servant of God, the keeper of the prison, who has no power over sinners, unless by the just judgment of God, the atonement is not to be made to this executor of the divine vengeance, but to the Supreme Ruler, who primarily, and principally holds them in durance. We may add, that it is a gratuitous and false supposition, that in the suffering of punishment, there must be some person to whom the punishment shall be rendered, as in a pecuniary debt. It is sufficient that there is a judge, who may exact it in order to support the majesty of the state, and maintain the order of the empire.

4. The person who makes the atonement is here to be considered. As sin is to be viewed in the threefold light of debt, enmity, and crime; and God in the threefold light of creditor, party offended, and judge; so Christ must put on a threefold relation corresponding to all these. He must sustain the character of a surety, for the payment of the debt. He must be a mediator, a peace-maker, to take away the enmity of the parties, and reconcile us to God. He must be a priest and victim, to substitute himself in our room, and make atonement, by enduring the penal sanction of the law. That such an atonement may be made, two things are requisite. 1. That the same *nature* which sins shall make restitution. 2. That the consideration given must possess infinite value, in order to the removal of the infinite demerit of sin. In Christ, two natures were necessary for the making of an atonement—a human nature which might suffer, and a divine nature which might give the requisite value to his sufferings.

Finally, We must demonstrate how it is possible, in consistency with justice, to substitute an innocent person, as Christ was, in our room, and shew what things are necessary to render such a substitution just; because, at first view, it appears not only to be unusual, but also unjust.

Though a substitution, which is common in a pecuniary debt, rarely occurs in penal transactions, nay, is sometimes prohibited, as was the case among the Romans, because no one is master of his own life, and because the commonwealth would suffer loss in such cases, yet it was not unknown among the heathen. We have an example of it in Damon and Pithias. They were intimate friends. One of them voluntarily entered himself bail to Dionisius in a capital cause. Curtius, Codrus, and Brutus, devoted themselves for their country.. The right of punishing hostages, when princes fail in their promises, has been recognized by all nations. Hence hostages are called ἀντίψυχοι, substitutes. To this Paul alludes, when he says, (Rom. v. 7.) "For a good man some would even dare to die." The holy scriptures often give it support, not only from the imputation of sin, by which one bears the punishment due to another, but from the public use of sacrifices, in which the victim was substituted in the place of the sinner, and suffered death in his stead. Hence the imposition of hands, and the confession of sins over the head of the victims.

But that such a substitution may be made without the slightest appearance of injustice, various conditions are requisite in the substitute or surety, all which are found in Christ: 1. A common nature, that sin may be punished in the same nature which is guilty, (Heb. ii. 14.) 2. The consent of the will, that he should voluntarily take the burden upon himself, (Heb. x. 9.) "*Lo I come to do thy will.*" 3. Power and right over his own life, so that, of his own right, he may resolve respecting his own life or death. (John x. 18.) "*No one taketh away my life, but I lay it down of myself, for I have power to lay it down, and take it up again.*" 4. The power of bearing the punishment due to us, and of freeing both himself and us from the power of death; because, if he himself could be holden of death, he could free no one from its dominion. That Christ possesses this power no one doubts. 5. Holiness and immaculate purity, that, being polluted by no sin, he might not have to offer sacrifice for himself but for us only. (Heb. vii. 26, 27, 28.)

Under these conditions it was not unjust for Christ to substitute himself in our room, while he is righteous and we unrighteous. By this act no injury is done to any one. Not to Christ, for he voluntarily took the punishment upon himself, and had power to decide concerning his own life and death, and also power to raise himself from the dead. Not to God the judge, for he willed and commanded it; nor to his natural justice, for the bail satisfied this by suffering the punishment which it demanded. Not to the empire of the universe, by depriving an innocent person of life, as Christ, freed from death, lives for evermore; nor by the life of the surviving sinner injuring the kingdom of God, for he is converted and made holy by Christ. Not to the divine law, for its honour has been maintained by the perfect fulfilment of all its demands, through the righteousness of the Mediator; and by our legal and mystical union, he becomes one with us, and we one with him. Hence he may justly take upon him our "*griefs and sorrows*," and impart to us his righteousness and blessings. So there is no abrogation of the law, no derogation from its majesty, no diminution of its claims; as what we owed is transferred to the account of Christ, to be paid by him.

These preliminary remarks we have thought necessary, in order to the lucid discussion of the question concerning the necessity of the atonement. We now proceed to enquire whether it was necessary that Christ should satisfy for us, as well absolutely, in relation to the divine justice, as hypothetically, on the ground of a divine decree:—Whether it was absolutely necessary in order to our salvation, that an atonement should be made, God not having the power to pardon our sins without a satisfaction, or whether it was only rendered necessary by the divine decree? The Socinians indeed admit no kind of necessity. Some of the old divines, and some members of the Reformed church, contend for a hypothetical necessity only. They think it sufficient for the refutation of the heretic. But we, with the great body of the orthodox, contend for both. We do not urge a necessity simply natural, such as that of fire to burn,

which is involuntary, and admits of no modification in its exercise. It is a moral and rational necessity for which we plead; one which flows from the holiness and justice of God, and cannot be exercised any other way than freely and voluntarily, and which admits of various modifications, provided there is no infringement of the natural rights of Deity.

That there is such a necessity is evinced by many arguments. 1. The vindictive justice of God. That such an attribute is natural and essential to God, has been proved at large elsewhere. This avenging justice belongs to God as a judge, and is essentially connected with that character which he sustains, and with which he can no more dispense, than he can cease to be a judge, or deny himself; though, at the same time, he exercises it freely. It does not consist in the exercise of a gratuitous power, like mercy, which, whether it be exercised or not, injustice is done to no one. It is that attribute by which Deity gives to every one his due, and from the display of which, when proper objects are presented, God can no more abstain, than he can do what is unjust. This justice is the constant will of punishing sinners, which in Deity, cannot be inefficient, as his majesty is supreme, and his power infinite. And hence the infliction of punishment upon the transgressor or his surety is inevitable. A regard to the liberty of God, which he exercises in positive acts, forms no objection to this; nor does his mercy; which, though it may free the sinner from punishment, does not demand that sin shall not be punished.

2. The nature of sin, which is a moral evil and essentially opposed to holiness, forms another argument. The connection between it and physical evil is natural and necessary. As physical evil, or penal evil cannot exist without moral evil, either personal or imputed, so there cannot be moral evil without producing natural evil. Moral and physical good, or holiness and happiness are united together by the divine wisdom, as well as by the goodness and justice of God, so that a good man must be happy, for goodness is a part of the divine image. The wicked must be miserable,

as God is just; and this the rather, because when God gives blessings to the righteous, he does it of his own bounty, out of mere liberality bestowing on the creature what it cannot claim by merit; but when he punishes the sinner, he renders to him precisely what he has merited by his sins.

3. The sanction of the law, which threatens death to the sinner. (Deut. xxvii. 29. Gen. ii. 17. Ez. xviii. 20. Rom. i. 18, 32. and vii. 23). Since God is true and cannot lie, these threatenings must necessarily be executed either upon the sinner, or upon some one in his stead. In vain do our opponents reply, that the threatening is hypothetical, not absolute, and may be relaxed by repentance. This is a gratuitous supposition. That such a condition is either expressed or understood neither has been, nor can be proved. Nay, as the penal sanction of the law is a part of the law itself, which is natural and indispensable, this sanction must also be immutable. With the judicial threatenings of the law, we must not confound particular and economical comminations, or such as are paternal and evangelical, which are denounced against men to recal them to repentance. Such threatenings may be recalled in case of penitence. Of this kind were those denounced against Hezekiah (Isaiah xxxviii.) and against Nineveh, (Jon. iii.)

4. The preaching the gospel forms another topic of argumentation, from which we may prove the necessity of the death of Christ. It announces the violent and painful death of the Mediator and surety, on the cross, and confirms it with the greatest cogency, by the narration of the circumstances of that event. Wherefore, we cannot believe that God should multiply sufferings *unnecessarily*. His goodness and wisdom do not permit us to harbour an idea, that the Father could expose his most innocent, and supremely beloved Son, to a death most excruciating and ignominious without a necessity, which admits of no relaxation. The only necessity which can be possibly imagined here, is that of making an atonement to the divine justice, for our sins. Every one must perceive that it was absolutely necessary. I know that

our opponents affect to produce various other weighty and important reasons, for the accursed death of the cross, such as the confirmation of Christ's doctrine, and to set examples of all kinds of virtue, especially of charity and constancy! But since Christ had confirmed his doctrines by numerous stupendous miracles, and through his life had given the most illustrious examples of every human virtue, who could believe that God, for that one cause alone, would expose his only begotten Son to torments so multiplied and excruciating? Therefore without all doubt, there were other causes for that dispensation; a regard for the honor of his justice, and the interests of the divine government. To this the Holy Spirit bears witness by the apostle Paul, (Rom. iii. 5.) who affirms that "God hath set forth Christ *to be a propitiation for our sins,*—εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, *to declare his righteousness,*" which was inexorable, and did not suffer our sins to be pardoned on any other terms, than by the intervention of the death of Christ.

Again, if God was able and willing by his word alone, without any atonement to pardon our sins, why does the apostle Paul so often and emphatically refer our justification and salvation to the blood of Christ? "We are," saith he, "*justified by the redemption which is in his blood.*" (Rom. iii. 24.) "*We have redemption through his blood; the remissions of sins.*" (Eph. i. 7.) "*He hath reconciled all things to himself by the blood of Christ.*" (Col. 1. 20.) Now there was no need that his blood should be shed if it depended solely upon the divine will. On this supposition, the apostle would rashly and falsely affirm, what he often affirms, that the blood of bulls and of goats, that is the sacrifices under the law, could not take away sins; and that the oblation of Christ alone could. If there was no need of any purgation and if penitence alone was sufficient to take *away sin*, that is the guilt of sin, without any sacrifice, the apostle's assertion is groundless. What could be taken away without any sacrifice at all, could surely be removed by legal sacrifices. If the divine will alone is necessary, why is it that Paul never refers to it, but always ascends to the na-

ture of things, as when he asserts that is was impossible for the blood of bulls to take away sins? Surely it must be because sin is so hateful to God, that its filth can be washed away by nothing less than the blood of the Son of God.

5. If there was no necessity that Christ should die, the greatness of God's love in not sparing his own Son, but delivering him up for us all, which the apostle commends, will be not a little diminished. If there was no obstacle on the part of justice, in the way of our salvation, it would indeed have been great grace in God to have forgiven our sins. But it would have fallen far short of that stupendous love which, though justice inexorable stood in the way, removed, by means found in the treasures of infinite wisdom, all impediments to our redemption, displaying a most amiable harmony between justice and mercy. Nor can Christ be said to have appeased the wrath of God, if he without demanding any satisfaction, could by a volition, without any other means, have laid aside his own wrath.

Finally, our opinion relative to the necessity of an atonement does not, in the least, derogate from any of the divine perfections. Not from God's absolute power, because he can neither deny himself nor any of his attributes, nor can he act in such a way as to give the appearance of delighting in sin, by holding communion with the sinner.—Not from the freedom of his will, because he can will nothing contrary to his justice and holiness, which would be injured should sin go unpunished.—Not from his boundless mercy, for this is exercised towards the sinner, though punishment is inflicted on the Surety. On the contrary it makes a glorious display of the most illustrious of the divine perfections—of his holiness on account of which he can have no communion with the sinner, until by an atonement, his guilt is removed, and his pollution purged—of his justice, which inexorably demands punishment of sin—of his infallible wisdom and boundless goodness.

CHAPTER II.

On the Truth of the Atonement.

HAVING in the last chapter asserted the necessity of the atonement; I shall now endeavour to prove its truth, which the Socinians not only call in question, but which they also expressly deny. Though in order to conceal their real views, they appear willing to retain the word satisfaction, and though they often use it, yet it is in a sense widely different from that of the orthodox divines. In order clearly to ascertain the point at issue, I shall make a few preliminary remarks.

The subject in controversy is not, whether Christ, by a general satisfaction, has fulfilled all the conditions which the divine will imposed upon him, in order to procure our salvation, for our adversaries admit such a satisfaction; at least Crellius professes to do so, in his book against Grotius. But we enquire whether the satisfaction made by Christ was strictly penal, and not only fulfilled the will of God, but also satisfied divine justice; Christ having taken upon himself our sins. Our opponents deny; we affirm.

The controversy does not respect a metaphorical satisfaction, which is effected by a nominal remission of sin—a satisfaction, which by supplication obtains through the mere indulgence of God, some favour. This is admitted, and often spoken of by our adversaries to deceive the simple. But they pertinaciously deny that Christ has made a true and proper satisfaction, by paying a full price, and by obtaining through his merits, the acquittal of the sinner, and

this on the ground of justice. We maintain that this is the true scriptural atonement.

It is not whether the death of Christ is advantageous to us, and in various respects promotes our interests; for this also, they willingly admit. It is whether, by substituting himself in our place, he suffered the punishment due to us. We maintain that he did.

It is not whether Christ is our Saviour, on account of his revealing truth, and announcing to us the way of salvation; on account of the example of his life, in which he displayed his power, and wrought miracles to confirm the truth; or on account of his efficacious power, by which he will assuredly bestow on us this salvation; for all this Socinus* grants to Christ. The great subject of debate is, whether Christ, by his satisfaction and merits, is our Saviour in the strictest sense of the word. Our opponents have openly made the utmost exertions to overturn this doctrine, which has been constantly held by the orthodox, and proved by various solid and irresistible arguments.

Our first argument is drawn from those scriptural texts in which Christ is said to have redeemed us—to have redeemed us by his blood, by a price properly so called, one perfectly sufficient; and which assert that a satisfaction in its true and proper sense has been made. Price refers to distributive justice—justice which gives every one his due. Numerous are the passages of scripture which speak of Christ's sufferings, as a price. "†*Ye were redeemed by a price.*" "‡*Ye were redeemed from your vain conversation, not by corruptible things such as silver and gold, but by the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without spot.*" "§*Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem (purchase) us from all iniquity.*" "‖*In whom we have redemption through his blood.*" "*The Son of man came that he might lay down his life a ransom for many*"—λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, i. e. a price of payment for many, or in the room of many. The name Je-

* Chap. 9. Book I. de Servatore, Chap. 5, 6. † 1 Cor. vi. 20.
‡ 1 Pet. i. 19. § Tit. ii. 14. ‖ Eph. i. 7.

sus denotes the same thing. "*He is called Jesus because he saves his people from their sins."

Though the word redemption is sometimes used in scripture to denote a mere deliverance, which is procured without the payment of any price, as Moses is called λυτρωτης, a deliverer;† and as God is said to have "*redeemed Israel out of the house of bondage*;" yet it does not follow that in this argument, it is to be taken in that sense. Many things prove that in the business of man's salvation, the word is to be understood as signifying redemption by the payment of a price. 1. This is the primary import of the words λυτρον, ανα-λυτρον, and we may in no case give them any other, unless for a very solid reason. This is not denied by Socinus himself‡. "To redeem any one, properly signifies nothing else but to free a captive, by paying a price to him who detains him." 2. Because the conditions of freeing man require this; as man is a prisoner to death, Satan and sin; to the law and to justice; and that both in relation to guilt and pollution. He is condemned of God and a child of wrath; from which evils he cannot be freed, but by making a satisfactory payment. 3. Such is the redemption procured by the price mentioned, 1 Cor. vi. 20. Why should the apostle use λυτρον and τιμη, price of redemption and punishment, if no price was paid. The reply usually made to this, is that the term is used in a figurative sense, and denotes that we are freed from the power of sin. This is an assumption, which, as we do not grant it, our opponent is bound to prove. Nay, the contrary is evident. The price is compared to very precious earthly things, such as gold, silver and jewels, which have always a relation to price, strictly so called, 1 Pet. i. 18. 4. We have not only the word λυτρον, a price of redemption, but also the word αντιλυτρον, applied to the suffering and death of Christ. The word λυτρον might admit of quibbling, but nothing can be more express than the word αντιλυτρον. It denotes not merely a price, but such a price as is perfectly

* Matt. i. 21. † Acts, vii, 35. Deut. vii. 8.
‡ Book xii. chap. i.

equal to the debt, which it pays; this is the force of the preposition ἀντὶ, which expresses substitution. Aristotle, who surely understood the Greek language, uses the word ἀντίλυτρον, in the 9th book of his Ethics, and 2d chapter, to denote the redemption or purchasing of a life, by substituting another life in its room.

Hence it appears that this redemption is not a mere manumission, such as that in which a master, without any price, sets free his slaves; nor is it simply an act of power, by which prisoners are rescued from the hand of an enemy; nor a bare exchange such as that of prisoners of war. No, this redemption is much more. It is made by a perfect satisfaction, a full payment, such as a surety makes for the debtor. Our deliverance, indeed, is procured without any price paid on our part, and purely through the free grace and mercy of God.* The divine power too is displayed gloriously, as exercised in emancipating us from the tyrannical dominion of Satan, over whom Christ obtains a victory and triumph.† There is also an exchange in respect of Christ, who was substituted in our place, and suffered the punishment due to us; yet in relation to the justice of God a perfect satisfaction must be made.

The truth of the atonement is also proved from those passages of scripture, in which Christ is said to have died, not only for the promotion of our interests, but also in our stead, as a substitute. "‡*For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly—in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us*". "§*For Christ also hath suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust.*" Our reasons for understanding these phrases in this sense and none other, are:—1. This is the common import of the preposition ὑπὲρ (for) which is used in these texts, and which when applied to persons, denotes among the Greeks substitution: as in Romans, v. 7. "Scarcely for a just man will one die," i. e. in his place, and in Romans, xi. 3. "ἀναθέμα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν-

* Rom. iii. 24. Eph. ii. 8.
‡ Rom. v. 6, 7.
† Col. ii. 15.
§ 1 Pet. iii. 18.

φῶν," "for or in the room of his brethren." 2. It is elsewhere expressed by ἀντὶ, in the room of, as in Matt. xx. 28, and by ἀντίλυτρον, a price of redemption, as in 1 Tim. ii. 6. "*Who gave him a ransom* (ἀντίλυτρον) *for all.*" Both of these import substitution—life for life, lex talionis. "*Eye for* (ἀντὶ) *eye*".* 3. Christ is said to have died for us in a manner peculiar to himself, a manner in which neither Paul nor Peter can be said to die, or be crucified for us.† Both Paul and Peter might die for our edification and confirmation in the faith. Hence the sufferings and death of Christ were vicarious; and in their design entirely different from that of the apostles or martyrs. Though the apostles may be said to have suffered for the church, yet it does not follow from this, that the object of their death was the same with that of Christ's. They suffered as martyrs for truth, to edify, confirm, and comfort the church, by bearing an honest, and severely tried testimony to the truth of the Christian system; as it is expressed by the apostle.‡ "*Whether we be afflicted, it is for your consolation,*" &c. but Christ alone laid down his life to redeem the church. And if we are commanded to lay down our lives for our brethren,§ as Christ laid down his life for us, we are thereby taught not to refuse to undergo the danger of death, nay to suffer with firmness even death itself, whenever the glory of God, the good of our neighbour, or the edification of the church requires it, as the martyrs have done. Hence, indeed, we may also infer that we should in this imitate the example of Christ, in bearing witness to the Christian system; but it does not hence follow, that our death for our brethren, is for the same purposes as Christ's death for us. We are unable to pay a ransom for our brother, that we may free him from death, as the inspired psalmist expresses it in Psalm xlix. 8. nor by our death can we procure their reconciliation with God, nor can we by it purge them from sin—all which Christ does for his people, by his death. Thus our

* Matt. v. 38.
† 1 Cor. i. 13.
‡ 2 Cor. i. 6.
§ 1 John, iii. 16.

death may in some respects be compared to that of Christ, but not in all. In relation to an example of love, a comparison may be instituted, but not in relation to the merit of satisfaction. The particle καθως, *as*, denotes similitude, not equality. Its power may be learned from its use, in Matt. v. 48. "*Be ye perfect, even as* (καθως) *your Father in heaven is perfect.*" No one will presume to say that we are here commanded to be equally as holy as God.

Another source of proof, in favour of Christ's having made such a satisfaction as that for which we contend, is derived from those portions of holy writ in which Christ is said *to have borne our sins*, and on account of them to have been afflicted, to have been wounded, to have died.* "*He bore our sins in his own body on the tree.*" The Chaldee Paraphrase, and the ancient Jews, consider the prophet Isaiah as treating of Messiah, in this chapter of his prophecy. "*He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows—he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities—the chastisement of our peace was upon him—the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity*" (i. e. the punishment) "*of us all—he shall make his soul an offering for sin.*" In proving the atonement from these texts, we reason as follows. 1. *From bearing our sins:*—though to bear and to carry sometimes, by a figurative mode of speaking, are put for taking away and pardoning,† yet there is no good reason why we should understand them in these passages in this figurative sense. Nay, there are most weighty reasons, which forbid us to depart from this primary and most common signification, as Socinus himself acknowledges.‡ To bear sin, is the same thing as to bear the punishment of sin.

The word נשא which sometimes relates to a simple taking away of sin, is indeed used; but the word סבל which signifies the bearing of a burden laid upon one, is also used, and clearly intimates the suffering of punishment. 2. The

* 1 Pet. ii. 24.

† Exod. xxxiv. 7. and Numb. xiv. 18.

‡ Prælec. cap.

manner in which the sins are borne, confirms us in this view of the passage. The sins are borne by being bruised and wounded. Sin is also said *to be laid upon him*. None of these could be said, unless Christ took upon himself and suffered the punishment of sin. 3. Christ made his soul an offering, and laid down his life an offering for sin, bore sin in the manner of a victim; nay, he made himself in reality a victim by suffering death, and shedding his blood in the room of sinners. 4. All things which indicate a real satisfaction occur in this portion of scripture—our sins as the moving, the meritorious cause, "*he was bruised for our iniquities*," v. 4, 5, 6—the suffering of punishment due to sin; "*he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows*," v. 4—the imputation of our sins to Christ, by God as a judge; "*the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all*," v. 6—the voluntary undertaking of Christ as our surety; "*he was oppressed and afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth*," in complaining of his sufferings, or in refusing to bear them, v. 8—an expiation for sin and a full payment of the debt; "*yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin*," v. 8. 10. Now, with what degree of propriety, could all these things be affirmed; if Christ laid down his life merely to exhibit an example of patience, and love; and not to make satisfaction for sin? It would be an idle pomp of language.

In Matt. viii. 17. we are, indeed, informed that this prophecy of Isaiah was fulfilled, when Christ healed bodily diseases, which, properly speaking, he did not bear, but take away; yet we cannot infer from this, that the same thing may be affirmed of sins which are the diseases of the mind; for the diseases of the body are to be viewed in a different light from those of the mind. In healing the former, it was not necessary that Christ should himself become sick; it was only necessary that he should exercise his power. Not so the latter. He must first take them upon himself before he could take them away from us. Hence he is held forth by the prophet as wounded and bruised, which were not necessary to the healing of bodily maladies, but to bearing those

of the mind alone; from which it is easy to infer what the mind of the Holy Spirit is in this prophecy, and how it is said to have been fulfilled when Christ healed corporal diseases. Without doubt, it relates primarily to spiritual disease, and debility, i. e. to sin, the punishment of which was laid upon him, that he might suffer its desert in our room. But bodily infirmities and pains, are a part of the punishment of sin, and on this account, in a secondary and subordinate sense it refers to them; because Christ had a right to heal them. Thus what the prophet declares in general, concerning all diseases, Peter applies in particular to the diseases of the mind, and Matthew to the diseases of the body, not excluding, but rather including those of the mind. He demonstrates, that by removing the cause the effect was taken away. Spiritual and physical maladies are intimately connected with each other; the former draw after them the latter, while the latter presuppose the former. Christ is said to have borne both—the diseases of both the body and the soul, but in respects different, according to their different natures. Bodily griefs he bore only by efficaciously taking them away, not by undergoing them in his own person; but he bore spiritual griefs, in two respects,—by suffering them himself, and by taking them away. Nor if Matthew asserts, that Christ healed the sick, and thus fulfilled this prophecy, may we thence rightly infer, that the spirit refers to them alone; because it is well known, that in the scriptures, a prophecy is said to be accomplished, not only when it is completely and ultimately fulfilled, but also when a partial accomplishment of it is begun.

The truth of the atonement is also confirmed by those scriptures, which assert, that Christ was made sin and a curse for us.* How can he be said "*to have been made sin*," i. e. a victim, an offering for sin, by God as a judge; and a "*curse*" i. e. a subject of the malediction, which the law pronounces against sinners; not indeed for himself, seeing he was most holy, and supremely beloved by his father, but

* Gal. iii. 13. and 2 Cor. v. 21. Lev. viii. 9.

as being substituted in our place, and taking upon himself, that curse which the law justly pronounces against our sins, in order that he might bear it, and by bearing it take it away? Thus he was made a blessing, by procuring for us the remission of our sins, and a right to eternal life. What would more examples avail here? How could mere confirmation of doctrine effect all this? Is it not most evident, that there was a real substitution of Christ in our room; and in consequence of this substitution, that a real satisfaction, expiation, or atonement has been made, and that this is the doctrine taught by these scriptural phrases? The force of this argument cannot be evaded, by objecting, that Christ is not said to have been a curse, on account of having really borne the curse of the law, which could not have been laid on him, a perfectly blessed and holy person; but because he suffered crucifixion; which, under the law was denominated a curse. The very words of the apostle, and the redemption from the curse of the law, which Christ by his death procured for us, evince the futility of the objection. How can he be a curse, and that for the express purpose of delivering us from the curse, unless he took upon himself the curse due to us? It is no solid objection to this reasoning, that he is the only begotten Son, and the ever blessed God, because he did not endure the curse, in, and for himself as the Son of God, but as our surety and on our behalf. Hence as to his person, he is styled "blessed forever," and in his official character as our representative, he is said to have suffered the punishment due to our sins.

Hence we are enabled to understand the force of the expression, "*he was delivered for our offences.*"* Socinus contends, that all which is here intended, is, that an *occasion* for the death of Christ, was given by our offences, or that Christ died only with the view that he might by his example, incline us to leave off the commission of sin, and render us certain of its pardon. All which is incompatible with the scriptures quoted above, which teach us, that the meritorious and

* Rom. iv. 25.

moving cause, for Christ's being delivered over to death, was our sins, that he might suffer the punishment due to them, and take away their guilt. He is said "*to have been delivered for our offences*," as sacrifices were offered for sin, doubtless, on account of its guilt, and to take it away. Hence the guilt of our sins was the meritorious cause of the death of Christ, and its final cause, or chief end, to expiate, and remove this guilt. The truth of the atonement is further proved, from the sacrifice of Christ when he expired on the cross, and of which the scriptures so often speak.* Why should Christ be so often, and so expressly called a priest, truly and properly a priest, far more excellent than all the Levitical priests; having by his oblation appeased the wrath of God, and obtained eternal salvation for us, unless, because a full expiation for sin has been made by his satisfaction; and unless a more luminous display of the truths shadowed forth by the ancient figures, has been made in Christ? As by the sacrifices under the law, doctrines were not confirmed, examples of love and obedience were not given, no covenant was entered into, nor could they, by their own efficacy, either take away sin, or appease the wrath of God; these sacrifices must have been instituted with a primary view to represent a real satisfaction, an atoning sacrifice for sin. This is more particularly confirmed: 1. From the nature of the priesthood which Christ sustains. He is constituted a priest in things pertaining to God, to appease him by an atoning sacrifice. 2. From the nature of the victim which is substituted in the room of sinners, to bear the punishment of death due to them, as evinced by the rite of imposing hands upon the head of the offering, and over it making a confession of sin. 3. From the threefold effect of the sacrifice—in respect of God, making reconciliation—in respect of sin, purging it—and in taking away its guilt: from the expiation of sin, and its pardon, which follow the reconciliation made with God. A person cannot be freed, and obtain pardon,

* Isai. liii. 10. John i. 29. Eph. vi. 2. and the Epistle to the Hebrews, passim.

without the substitution of a victim in his room; God cannot be appeased without the shedding of blood, nor can sin be expiated without the suffering of punishment.

The objections which Volkelius and others, oppose to this reasoning, do not, in the least, weaken its force. They object:—1. "That the propitiatory sacrifices, did not all prefigure the sacrifice of Christ; but the annual sacrifice only, which was offered upon the great day of expiation, and which contained no satisfaction; as a satisfaction could flow neither from the victims offered up, nor from the person of the chief priest."

The apostle Paul, on whose judgment more dependence is to be placed than on that of our opponents, opposes not one propitiatory sacrifice only, but all the sacrifices to that of Christ, and hence he infers their annulment.* Neither the perpetual sacrifice offered up daily, nor the other propitiatory offerings of lambs, which were of a private, not of a public nature, could refer to any thing else, but to the oblation of the immaculate lamb of God for us. It is no objection to this view of the subject, that they were offered for individuals, and not for all in common; for, as the sacrifices which were offered for the whole congregation of Israel, signified that Christ was to make a propitiation for the sins of all his people, so those, which were offered for each individual, were designed to shew, that every individual of Christ's people laden with sin, should seek and obtain reconciliation through the offering of Christ. Farther, although those sacrifices did not, in the sight of God, contain a satisfaction, properly so called; because the soul of man is of too exalted a value to be purchased with the blood of bulls or of goats, yet a typical, ceremonial satisfaction, pertaining to the purity of the flesh, was made by them†—a satisfaction, which by the appointment of God was to be attributed, neither to the victims, nor to the officiating priest separately, but jointly to both.

* Heb. vii. 27. and x. 4, 5. 11. † Heb. ix. 13.

Another objection offered is that:—"an expiation is only an entire deliverance from the dominion of sin, which deliverance cannot be in the way of merit, attributed to the death of Christ, but only in the way of example, and declaratively." In this objection, the cause is confounded with the effect. The office of the judge, who releases the prisoner, is confounded with the office of the surety who pays the ransom. The judge sets the prisoner at liberty, while the prisoner, or some one in his place, pays the price of his redemption. Hence it follows that the purging of guilt, and the removal of the accusation are effected by the suffering of punishment either in the person of the accused, or in that of another. If all the end answered by the death of Christ, was to declare that an expiation was to be made, it effected nothing more than the victims under the law, which might, nay did attest the same thing; yet the apostle Paul expressly declares, that they could not make expiation for sin. If there were any propriety in this objection, the expiation might be attributed no less to Christ's resurrection than to his death, which the scripture nowhere does. Besides, declaration respects men, expiation God; that belongs rather to his prophetical office, this to his priestly. Though the work of expiation may sometimes be attributed to God the Father,* who never makes satisfaction, yet we cannot justly infer that this expiation is of the same nature with that of Christ; because, according to the different nature of the subjects to whom the expiation is attributed, it is to be differently understood. In respect of God the Father, to expiate, is to accept of an expiation made by a priest, and is made by pardon and acceptance. But in relation to a priest and a victim, to expiate, is to effect an expiation meritoriously by the shedding of blood, and by vicarious suffering.

It is farther objected that:—"sacrifices were only offered up for smaller offences, such as were committed through ignorance or error; that for more aggravated, wilful transgressions, there were no sacrifices instituted; but that Christ

* Deut. xxi. 8.

died for all sins without distinction." This objection is grounded on an assumption, which we do not admit. It is indeed expressly contrary to scripture. On the great day of annual atonement, the goat is said to bear all the iniquities of the children of Israel. Sacrifices are elsewhere said to be offered up not for those sins only, which are committed through error, but for those which are committed willingly, and which are expressed by פשע, אשם, חטא, מעל, and similar words.* And though the priest is said † to have suffered for the errors (αγνοημασιν) of the people, yet it does not follow that wilful sins are excluded; for the word αγνοημα which signifies properly an error of the mind, is used to denote every kind of sin, because every sin proceeds from an error of the mind. Hence wicked men are called fools αφρονες. The Septuagint renders פשע and אשם by the Greek word αγνοια, and these Hebrew words signify wickedness and rebellion. For some aggravated crimes, such as murder, idolatry, adultery, &c. we do not read of any sacrifices having been particularly instituted; God determined to punish them by the sword of the civil magistrate, with capital punishment; and those who sinned thus had no need of this remedy, as their death was a satisfaction to the public. Yet we are no where told that the priests, when offering up sacrifices for the rest of the people, might not pray for the pardon of the sins of those very persons who were condemned to death. In no other way could sacrifices be offered up for them, for as they were to die immediately, they could not be made partakers of that ceremonial purity which entitled the Jewish worshipper to approach the altar.

Again, we argue for the doctrine of the atonement, from our reconciliation with God, which Christ by his death has procured for us. Since that reconciliation supposes the making up of the breach, which sin had produced between God and his creatures, this could not be effected without the removal of a twofold barrier, by a satisfaction. On the part of God, his justice must be satisfied, and on the part of man, the

* Lev. xvi. 21, 22. † Heb. ix. 6, 7.

guilt of sin must be removed by suffering the punishment due to it. The apostle Paul, every where, teaches us that Christ procured for us such a reconciliation.*

The substance of the objections which our opponents offer against this argument is, that "this reconciliation is effected by our conversion to God, and not at all by appeasing the divine wrath, because God is not said to be reconciled to us, but we to God; nay, that he is said to procure for us this reconciliation, which is not the part of an enemy but of a friend." This capital error of our opponents is refuted by many powerful arguments. 1. The scriptures speak of a double enmity and reconciliation, not only on the part of man who by sin is become a hater of God,† an enemy in his mind by wicked works‡ but also on the part of God, by his wrath which is revealed from heaven against all iniquity.§ Hence men are by nature children of wrath.‖ God is said to be of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.¶ "*He hates all workers of iniquity.*** Now as there is an alienation on both sides, so there must be on each side a reconciliation—on the part of God, by a turning away of his wrath—on the part of man, by a conversion to God, all which the apostle clearly teaches, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. In consequence of God's reconciling us to himself, through Christ, Paul shews that the apostles in the name of Christ exhorted sinners to be reconciled to God. 2. If reconciliation were nothing else, but conversion, then it should rather be said to proceed from Christ's holy life, than from his bloody death. On this ground no reason can be offered why the apostle should propose sanctification as the end of our reconciliation,†† for nothing can be the medium and end of itself. This would be to say that the end of reconciliation was reconciliation. 3. It is such a reconciliation as is effected by not imputing to us our sins, on account of their having been imputed to Christ, who was made sin for us,‡‡ a reconciliation effect-

* Rom. v. 10. 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. Col. i. 20, 21, &c. † Rom. i. 21.
‡ Col. i. 21. § Rom. i. 18. ‖ Eph. ii. 5. ¶ Hab. i. 13.
** Psalms, v. 5. †† Col. i. 22. ‡‡ 2 Cor. v. 18, 21.

ed by the substitution of Christ in our place, that he might die for us; as we collect from the comparison instituted between him, and the man who would dare to die for a good man,* which evinces a proper satisfaction, not a simple conversion. 4. This reconciliation is effected, "*by making peace through the blood of his cross*,"† and by an atoning sacrifice ἱλασμος.§ All these denote not mere conversion; but primarily, the appeasing of the divine wrath, which was effected by the death of a victim.

Though the scriptures commonly speak of our being reconciled to God, rather than of God's being reconciled to us, because those who offend have need to be reconciled to him who is offended; yet this, so far from excluding the reconciliation of God to us, includes it; because there can be no offence, unless justice is injured, and this injury must be repaired before God can reconcile men to himself, and admit them to hold communion with him. God's procuring this reconciliation for us, is no evidence that he has not been angry with us, or that he was at peace and in a state of friendship with us. It only proves that God moved towards us, with a love of benevolence, decreed to procure for us a reconciliation, with which he was well pleased, and through which he was reconcileable to us, while at the same time he could not but be offended with our sins, and with us as sinners, and could have no communion with us.

In vain it is plead by our opponents that,—"Christ is said to be our propitiation, and expiatory sacrifice; not that he may reconcile an angry God to us, but that he may testify that God is already well pleased, and by no means angry with us." The blood of Christ was not shed to prove the remission of sin, but to obtain it, as was the case in the propitiatory sacrifices under the Old Testament dispensation; otherwise, there was no need that Christ should die, and shed his blood, when the truth of the remission could be as well attested by his life and doctrine. Nor because the covering of the ark is improperly and declaratively called

* Rom. v. 7. † Col. i. 20. § 1 Joh. ii. 2.

ιλαστηριον, or an expiation, because by it God declared his benevolence towards his people; are we thence to infer that it was of the same nature with the expiation made by Christ. The making of expiation, is attributed to Christ not so much passively, as actively, and in the strictest sense of the word. What was only typically and symbolically shadowed forth in the mercy seat, and by the sprinkling of the blood of victims, Christ hath truly and properly effected by the shedding of his blood, by which he made a real atonement for sin. Again, though the application and fruit of this atonement, is imparted to us through the medium of his continual intercession for us in heaven, yet we may not hence infer that he has made it in heaven only. The passage in Heb. ii. 17, does not relate to this; for it is not there said that he makes reconciliation for the sins of the people in heaven, but only that he must be made like unto his brethren in all things, that he may be a faithful high priest, in things pertaining to God, and in this character make reconciliation, which he had done by his death, and suffering; all which is intimated in the following verse.

The doctrine of the atonement is also confirmed by the nature and circumstances of Christ's sufferings, as well as by the kind of death which he suffered; in all which we have every thing requisite to a full and perfect satisfaction. Let us consider the essence, and kind of the punishment. The death which he endured, was not a common death; it was not an ordinary, but a violent, a most bitter death, inflicted in the manner of a punishment—a death inflicted by a sword which the justice of God commanded to be drawn against him; "*awake, O sword against the man that is my fellow; smite the shepherd,*"—a death in which he endured the greatest possible ignominy, and in which the most acute pains tortured his most holy body. Was this all? No. His soul was seized with the most appaling terrors, and deepest sorrows, with such fear and poignant woes, that an angel was sent to minister comfort to him. Sweat flowed from every pore of his body like great drops of blood, and "he offered up prayers and supplications, with strong cry-

ing and tears to him who was able to save him."* With a voice of deepest sadness, he complained that he was forsaken by God the Father, though not by a dissolution of the union, nor by withdrawing a participation of holiness, nor by withholding his supporting power, yet by withholding from him the beatific vision, by suspending the joyful fruition of full felicity. How shall we find an adequate cause for all these sufferings in a perfectly holy person, unless by admitting that avenging justice demanded from Christ a full atonement for our sins? In order to evade the doctrine of the atonement, shall we say that Christ was of more feeble mind, and possessed less heroic firmness, than innumerable martyrs, who have suffered the same most painful death of the cross, nay if possible in excruciating torments more intolerable, and all with unshaken fortitude, with the greatest alacrity, and without any indications of grief or terror? Such blasphemy shocks the ears of the Christian. Though the time of Christ's sufferings was but finite in duration, yet in consequence of the dignity of the sufferer, it was equal in value to infinite duration of torment. The law indeed demands that the person who sins shall suffer, but the gospel, through the fatherly kindness of God, declares it meet that there shall be a substitution—that it suffices to punish sin, and let the sinner go free.

By the atonement we have an astonishing display of the divine mercy, which is so great that God spared not his own Son, that he might spare us. The atonement asserts the claims of justice, which, that it might remain unimpeachable, demanded even the blood of the Son of God. The atonement gloriously exhibits the divine wisdom, which found out an admirable plan, of reconciling mercy with justice, and untied a knot which otherwise could never have been loosed, a plan, by which the conscience of the traitor-man, alarmed with a penetrating sense of sin, judgment, and malediction, is rendered peaceful and serene. Take away the atonement, and what becomes of the truth of God, which so uniformly

* Heb. v. 7.

denounces death, and a curse against sinners? What becomes of justice, which not only acquits the guilty, and convicted criminal without inflicting upon him the deserved punishment, but also bestows on him rewards the most honourable? Besides, by denying the atonement, the following absurdities are unavoidable. 1. That our redemption may be attributed no less to the death of the apostles and martyrs, than to the death of Christ; since by their death, and sufferings, they have given strong testimony in favour of the doctrines of the Gospel, and have set before us in their lives illustrious examples of patience and obedience. 2. That Christ saved us rather by his life and miracles, than by his death, since the promulgation of doctrines, and the example of his life were much more plain exhibitions of truth than his death affords. 3. The priestly office is altogether taken away from this world and confounded with his prophetical, and kingly office. 4. The saints under the old testament were not saved by Christ; because they had not the benefit of his example, nor did they hear him preaching doctrines. We shall now proceed to remove the difficulties which are started.

Though the word satisfaction is not expressly used in the scriptures, yet, what is quite sufficient, there are words used in the scriptures which are altogether equivalent to it, and which either have no meaning, or they mean that real satisfaction for which we contend. Such are the words ἀπολυτρωσις which signifies the redemption of a captive, by making a payment—ἀντιλυτρον, a price of redemption—ἱλασμος, a propitiation—τιμη, a price of punishment—κατάρα, a curse—θυσια, a sacrifice—προσφορα an offering, and many others of the same import which we have mentioned above.

As Christ sustains a two-fold relation to believers, one in the character of their surety bound to satisfy justice in their behalf, the other in the character of their head and Lord operating in them, by the animating and directing influence of his Spirit; so he had a two-fold end in his death and sufferings; one the payment of a price of redemption for us to justice, the other to set before us an example worthy

of imitation. Hence his sufferings may be viewed either as satisfactory or as exemplary. Though the sufferings of Christ are proposed* to us as an example, and his death, as that which we should imitate by dying for our brethren, at his command;† yet we are not hence to infer that by his death he made no real satisfaction, for the mentioning of the one end does not exclude, but supposes the other.

There is a wide difference, between a payment made by a debtor in his own person, and a payment made by a surety. As to the reality of payment there is no difference in the eye of the law, but in relation to grace there is a striking difference. When a debtor pays out of his own purse his debts, it cannot be said that the creditor has forgiven him the debt or shown him favour; but if the debt has been paid by another and that other has been found out by the creditor, then grace may be said to have been shewn. Satisfaction, and remission are inconsistent with each other, when referred to the same thing, but not so when they are referred to different things. Satisfaction has God for its object, remission man for its object. Satisfaction is made by Christ to God for man, and yet man is freely pardoned. Justice and mercy reciprocate. Justice is exercised against sin as imputed to Christ, and mercy, free and sovereign mercy is shewn to sinners. The pardon granted to us is entirely of grace, while full satisfaction is demanded of the surety. Nothing is demanded of us, full payment having been made by Christ.

If Christ makes satisfaction, we cannot say that he satisfies himself, in the same character in which he makes the satisfaction;—he satisfies himself as God, and as the son of God, not as Christ. Thus it is not precisely the same character, nor in the same relation that he gives, and receives the satisfaction. Christ gives it as God-man, as mediator, and receives it as God the judge. Though it is not absurd to suppose that the same person should make satisfaction to himself, when the subject treated of is not a private satis-

* 1 Pet. ii. 21. † 1 John, iii. 16.

faction, by which a private loss is compensated, or money that is due paid, for so indeed the person would take of his own, and with it pay himself. But when we speak of a public satisfaction, by which a public injury is repaired, it is not absurd to say that a judge who has violated the law, may make satisfaction to himself as judge by suffering either in his own person, or in the person of another, that punishment which the law denounces; and thus it is in the work of redemption.

Christ did not suffer eternal death as to duration, but a death of three days only, and yet he fully paid the debt of everlasting punishment, which we owed. His which was one of finite duration, was equivalent to an everlasting death suffered by us, because of the infinite dignity of his person. His were not the sufferings of a mere man, but as to their value, those of the true God, who purchased the church with his blood.* Hence what was deficient in duration is supplied by the divinity of the sufferer, which gave infinite importance to a passion finite in duration. Yet we may not hence infer, that as the person suffering was infinite, one drop of his blood was sufficient for our redemption. The smallest passion of Christ might have infinite value considered merely in relation to the infinite exaltation of him who suffered; yet death only could possess infinite value, in respect of the judge by whose sentence it was inflicted. The dignity of the person increases the dignity of the punishment endured—the more exalted the person is, so much the more exalted is the suffering which he undergoes; yet nothing but that species of punishment which the law denounces can satisfy its claims upon the guilty. Death and death alone could fulfil the demands of law and justice.

It was not necessary, when Christ was suffering the punishment due to sin, that he should suffer that desperation, and gnashing of teeth, which are a part of the punishment of the damned; as these are not essential to the punishment which God inflicts upon the victims of eternal tor-

* Acts xx. 28.

ment, or to that which the surety must bear. They are circumstances, which arise from the character of the persons of the damned, who are vicious, and who when they find that their torments are necessary, overwhelming and eternal, sink into utter despair and gnashing of teeth. This could not be so with Christ, who in the midst of his greatest agonies, had full assurance of deliverance, and a resurrection from the tomb, and hence when encompassed by tortures, the most excruciating, he always manifested his faith in God—"*My God! My God!*" are his words.

Though a death of infinite value was due for every individual sinner, yet such a death as Christ's is quite sufficient for the redemption of the whole elect world. A penal satisfaction is not of the same nature with a pecuniary payment, which is only valued by the amount paid, without regard to the person who pays: and hence can be of avail to none but the individual for whom the payment is made. But penal satisfaction is appreciated by the dignity of the person who makes it, and is increased in worth in proportion to his dignity, and hence avails for many as well as for one. Money paid by a king is indeed of no more avail in the discharge of a debt, than money paid by a slave: but the life of a king is of more value than the life of a vile slave, as the life of king David was of more worth than that of half the Israelitish army.* In this way Christ alone is more excellent than all men together. The dignity of an infinite person swallows up all the infinities of punishment due to us—they sink into it and are lost. Besides it is no new thing that what is necessary for one should be amply sufficient for many. One sun is necessary to the illumination of an individual, and yet the same sun illuminates the whole human family. One victim was sufficient for the priest and all the people, and yet it would have been requisite for one. The great annual expiatory sacrifice, made atonement for all the people, while yet there were as many atonements necessary, as there were Israelites, because by divine appointment it

* 2 Sam. xviii. 3.

was offered for the whole congregation as well as for individuals. On this subject the scriptures are so express, that no one, unless he have the hardihood to contradict the Holy Spirit, can deny it. "*The Lord laid on him the iniquities of us all.*"* *If one died for all.*† "*By one offering of himself he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified.*"‡ What do all these scriptures teach, unless that one death of Christ is sufficient to make a full atonement for all the elect. Thus also the disobedience of Adam made many sinners.§ One cannot satisfy for many, when he and they are of the same rank. One plebeian cannot satisfy for many plebeians; but one prince may satisfy for many plebeians. If this is admitted among creatures who are all finite and mortal, how much more between creatures and the Creator, between whom there is an infinite distance?

The rule which is laid down in the 18th chapter of Ezekiel's prophecy, "*the soul that sinneth it shall die,*" cannot be understood as absolute and universal, for so all imputation of sin would be barred, which yet the scriptures teach by many examples. It must be referred to the ordinary dispensations of providence, and not to an extraordinary dispensation of grace. Or it may refer to a particular providence, to the Jews, to whom the Lord speaks in such a way as to close their mouth, and prevent them from complaining that they had undeservedly suffered punishment on account of the sins of their fathers; and not to the general government of men, in which God declares that he will visit the iniquities of the fathers upon the children until the third and fourth generations.‖

So far is the doctrine of the atonement from opening a door to impiety and spreading a couch on which spiritual sloth may repose in security; that it is the most efficacious means of holiness, and the death of sin itself, which is, among others, one of the ends, that Christ assigns for his death—"that being dead unto sin, we may

* Isai. liii. 6. † 2 Cor. v. 14. ‡ Heb. x. 4.
§ Rom. v. 18, 19. ‖ Exo. xx.

live unto righteousness; that henceforth we may no more live unto ourselves, but to him who died for us and was raised again for our justification." See the 6th chapter of Romans, for the manner in which the apostle Paul reasons on this subject; also Titus, ii. 14, and 1 Pet. ii. 24.

CHAPTER III.

On the Perfection of the Atonement.

In the preceding chapter we reasoned against the followers of Socinus. In this chapter we shall contend for a doctrine, that is denied by the Catholics. They indeed pretend to hold the unity and perfection of the satisfaction of Christ, and often exclaim that great injustice is done them, when they are charged with maintaining, that "*Christ by his sufferings did not make a full and complete satisfaction for our sins;*"* while in reality they, in many ways, weaken and overturn this doctrine, by maintaining that it must be confined to sins committed before baptism, and to the pollution of sin; but that it does not extend to punishment either temporal, or eternal.

In order to ascertain distinctly the question, we observe, that a satisfaction made to God is of a nature different from a satisfaction made to man. Among men, satisfactions are of two kinds. One is private, and is called a reparation; the other public, and is called canonical, because prescribed by the ancient canons of the church. Satisfaction of the latter kind is very often demanded by civil and ecclesiastical courts, for the reformation of offenders, and for the removal of scandals. In treating of the satisfaction made to God, we speak strictly concerning the λυτρον, the price of redemption, which Christ, as our surety paid for us, and thereby atoned for our transgressions. This is by Catholics in part ascribed to certain meritorious, expiatory works, by which they pretend to atone for their own sins, and for those

* Bellarmine, Book II. concerning indulgences, chapter 14.

of others. It is of the atonement for sin which Christ has made, of the satisfaction made to God, that we are to treat in this chapter. The point in controversy is not whether the satisfaction of Christ bars all human satisfactions, public, private, and canonical, which are imposed upon offenders for their correction, and to remove scandals from the church. We admit that these were, with propriety, often demanded under the Old Testament dispensation, and may yet be laudably exacted. But we inquire, whether, besides the satisfaction made by Christ, other satisfactions for sin are to be made to God, and should be imposed upon the saints. Here we and our opponents are at issue,—they affirm that such additional satisfactions are to be made by the saints themselves, while we maintain, and hope to prove, that they are not only useless, but contrary to the scriptural plan of salvation.

The infliction of chastisements on the people of God, when they go astray,—chastisements which are of a medicinal and corrective nature, such as are inflicted upon children in their father's house, form no part of this controversy. We cheerfully admit, and firmly believe, that God, for the most valuable purposes, exercises his people with such wholesome discipline. Does the atonement of Christ exclude penal expiatory sufferings on the part of the saints,—sufferings not designed as proofs of their piety, or to heal their backslidings, but as a satisfaction to avenging justice, inflicted not by God as a father, and through parental love, but decreed by God as a judge,—sufferings, which the law denounces against the wicked? Our adversaries affirm, that the atonement does not exclude such sufferings. We maintain that it does. The church of Rome teaches, that though the satisfaction of Christ is of infinite value, yet that it is not so full and ample, but that various atonements are to be made by believers in their own persons. These, they say are necessary, if not on account of their guilt, and liability to eternal punishment, which they admit are taken away by Christ, yet they are requisite to save them from temporal punishment. Hear what they say: " If any one shall affirm,

that on account of the merits of Christ, there is no necessity, that we should make any satisfaction to God, through temporal punishments inflicted by Christ, and patiently borne by us, or through punishments enjoined by the priest, not voluntarily undertaken; such as penances, prayers, fastings, alms, and other pious exercises, and shall further say, that the new life only is the best penitence, let that man be accursed."*

The Remonstrants,† or Arminians, endeavour not a little to destroy the perfection of the atonement. Though they have not yet been so bold as, with the disciples of Socinus, to reject the atonement entirely, yet they make every effort in their power, to diminish its efficacy and fulness. They maintain that the satisfaction of Christ was accepted by God, not on account of its own dignity, but merely through grace,—that it was not a real but a nominal satisfaction. The substance of the doctrine which they teach on this head is, that God acquiesced in the satisfaction made by the death of Christ, not because satisfaction had been truly rendered to his justice, but because he was graciously pleased to admit the satisfaction, notwithstanding its imperfection, as altogether sufficient.

The doctrine for which we contend is, that Christ hath so perfectly satisfied divine justice for all our sins, by one offering of himself; and not only for our sin, but also for both temporal, and eternal punishment, that henceforth there are no more propitiatory offerings to be made for sin;—and that, though for the promotion of their penitence and sanctification God often chastises his people, yet no satisfaction is to be made by them, either in this or in a future state of existence.

Such is the perfection of the atonement, that it corresponds to the justice of God revealed in the word, to the demands of the law, and to the miseries and necessities of those

* Council of Trent, session 4. cap. 8. canon 13.

† A name given to Arminians, on account of the remonstrance which they presented to the synod of Dort, against that act, by which their tenets were condemned.

for whom it was made. Had it been in its own nature deficient, and derived its sufficiency only from God's acceptance of it through mere grace, then the victims under the law might have possessed equal efficacy in making atonement for sin, contrary to Heb. x. 4. The atonement derives its perfection from its own intrinsic fulness of merit. It is perfect; 1. In respect to parts; because it satisfied, by its expiatory efficacy, all the demands which the law makes upon us, both in relation to the obedience of life, and the suffering of death. By enduring the punishments due to us, it has freed us from death and condemnation. The satisfaction is perfect as to its meritorious efficacy; for it reconciles God the Father to us, and has acquired for us a title to eternal life. 2. It is perfect in degree; for Christ has not only done and suffered all that which the law claims of us, but all this in a full and perfect degree, so that nothing more in this respect, can possibly be desired. The perfection of the atonement in degree, is derived from the infinite dignity of the person who makes it, and the severity of the punishment exacted. Hence follows another view of the perfection of Christ's satisfaction—that which regards its effects. In respect of God, it has effected an entire reconciliation with him;*—in relation to sin, it has made full expiation, and on account of this expiation pardon is obtained†—and in relation to believers, its effects are perfection in holiness, and complete redemption, both as to deliverance from death, and as to a title to life and its possession.‡

We shall offer the proofs by which we establish this view of the atonement. 1. The dignity of Christ's person, which is not only of immaculate purity, but also truly divine—a person in which all fulness dwells.§ In Christ's person there is a fulness of divinity, a fulness of office, a fulness of merit, and of graces; who then can doubt, but that the satisfaction which he has made is one of infinite value and efficacy, one of such fulness, and all-sufficiency that nothing

* Rom. v. 10. and 2 Cor. v. 18.
† Eph. i. 7. Heb. i. 3. and ix. 26.
‡ Heb. ix. 12. and x. 14.
§ Col. i. 19.

can be added to it, and especially by feeble man. For though Christ's human nature, which was the instrument in the obedience and sufferings, was finite, yet this does not lessen the value of the satisfaction, because it derives its perfection from the divine person of Christ, to which all his actions must be attributed; as he is the person who obeyed, and suffered.

The perfection of the atonement is also established, from the oneness of Christ's offering. Why does the apostle Paul assert, that Christ has *once* offered himself for us,* and that by one offering of himself he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified? Why does he always set before us the obedience of Christ alone as the ground of our justification, unless this obedience is full and complete? As a repetition of the same offering argues its imperfection, so on the other hand, an offering's having been but once made, necessarily imports its plenitude, and the full accomplishment of its object.

Our view of the atonement is confirmed by the approbation which it obtained from God as judge. If God declares that he is perfectly satisfied, let no one dare to say that the satisfaction is imperfect. The question is whether the supreme judge, who demands the satisfaction, approves of and receives it as altogether sufficient. That the atonement has been approved and accepted by God, is established, not only from the appointment of Christ to the mediatory office, of whom in the mediatory character, the Father often declares that he is his beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased; but especially by his resurrection from the dead, which is irresistible evidence both of his divinity, and of the perfection of the atonement.† Unless Christ had satisfied to the uttermost farthing, can we believe that God the judge, whose inexorable justice demands full payment, would have freed him, and have exalted him to that supreme glory, which at the Father's right hand, he hath obtained as a reward of his sufferings.‡ Would the creditor free the surety from prison

* Heb. vii. 9. and 10. † Rom. i. 4. ‡ Phil. ii. 9.

before he had paid the full debt? Could Christ, when he had undertaken to pay to divine justice the debts which man owed, be set free, until he had to the full redeemed the debt? Seeing then that Christ has gloriously arisen by his own power, and by the power of the Father, there is no room left for doubt respecting the perfection of the satisfaction, the full payment of the price of redemption; of the full discharge of which, the Father has given us such indubitable testimony. The effects which are produced by the atonement prove its entire sufficiency. Why are our reconciliation with God, the appeasing of his wrath, the expiation and pardon of sin; and all these not partial but full and complete—also our redemption and glorification, all attributed to the death and obedience of Christ,* unless his atonement was full and complete? A perfect effect requires a perfect cause to produce it.

In vain do our opponents contend, "that by pleading for satisfactions to be made by the Saints, they do not derogate from the infinity of Christ, nor from his satisfaction; since they make all their virtue and efficacy to depend upon the atonement of Christ, who not only has satisfied for us, but also gives us the power to satisfy for ourselves—and since they do not esteem our good works, as atonements to be associated with that of Christ, and as of the same exalted nature, but inferior and subordinate." They assume what they ought to prove. We do not grant that Christ gives us any power to atone for ourselves. Such a supposition receives no countenance from scripture, and is contrary to the very nature of Christ's atonement. It is one thing to make satisfaction, another to give the power to make satisfaction. They are indeed, utterly inconsistent with each other. If Chris has made a complete satisfaction, why is any other demanded? Where the primary cause is solitary, no co-operative, or subordinate causes are admissible. So far is this doctrine of our opponents from advancing the glory of Christ, that it

* See Col. i. 20. 2 Cor. v. 21. 1 Joh. i. 7. Rom. iii. 24. and v. 10. Heb. i. 3. and ix. 14. and x. 14.

in reality, by resorting to other grounds of salvation than those afforded by him, offers an indignity to him and his atonement. What he, as our Redeemer, has engaged to accomplish, they pretend to effect, at least in part, by other agents. And though in the application of this redemption, men are bound to contribute by their efforts, as fellow-workers with God, yet they are unable to co-operate with him in its acquisition.

Equally futile is their reasoning, when they resort to the distinction between sin and punishment—when they contend, that though Christ has satisfied for our sin, he has not fully satisfied for our punishment, or if for eternal punishment, at least not for temporal, which must be suffered by the Saints themselves, either in the present, or in a future state. Because the remission of sin on account of the satisfaction made by Christ is perfectly complete; "*there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus;*" and in consequence of his atonement, their justification is perfect, and in due time they shall obtain full glorification.* This distinction between satisfying for sin, and its punishment, is absurd, for in the providence of God, there is a necessary connection between sin and suffering. Sin is the cause and suffering the effect; take away the cause, and the effect is necessarily destroyed. Remission of sin is nothing else but a deliverance from all punishment, and obligation to punishment, which cannot be justly inflicted where there is no transgression. Would it be just to demand the payment of a debt already, either paid, or remitted?

They also assert, "that Christ in a limited sense, makes satisfaction for temporal punishment, in us, and by us." 1. This assertion is rash, having no countenance from scripture. 2. It is dangerous, associating men with Christ in making satisfaction, and thus taking a part of the work of redemption out of his hands; for redemption, and satisfaction are words of similar import, there being no other way to redeem, but by rendering satisfaction. 3. It is false and

* Rom. viii. 9.

contrary to scripture, which asserts, that Christ by himself, hath satisfied once for sin, and that there is no farther satisfaction to be made by others.

The view which we have given of the perfection of the atonement, and the arguments, by which we have supported it, prostrate the Arminian doctrine of nominal atonement. When a full payment is made, there is no room for the exercise of grace in accepting what was no more than nominal. In making payments grace is not considered, nor merely the dignity of him who pays, but also the value of the thing given, or its equality to the debt. This is confirmed from Rom. viii. 3. where Christ is said to have been sent, that all righteousness might be fulfilled.

Christ fulfilled all righteousness, or satisfied all the demands of the law, by doing what we ourselves were not able to do, on account of the weakness of the law. Now, if by the satisfaction of Christ, the demands of the law are fulfilled in us, this satisfaction must equal the claims of the law.

An imperfect atonement graciously accepted, we cannot admit, for Christ took all the punishment upon himself* which was due to us, even that which was the most grievous, the curse of the law itself.† Finally, if God might have accepted of any imperfect satisfaction, it was unnecessary that Christ should stand as our surety, and be exposed to extreme tortures, and a most painful death; for satisfaction could have been received from any other man.

We shall now proceed to remove objections. An objection is drawn from those expressions of scripture, where the apostles are said to suffer for the church. But it is one thing to suffer for the church, in order to purchase her, by paying a price of redemption, and another to suffer persecution and death for the purpose of consoling, comforting, and confirming the people of God, by placing before them an example of patience and obedience. Paul says that he suffers for the church, or for the body of Christ,‡ not in the first

* Isa. liii. 6, 7, 8.

† Gal. iii. 13.

‡ Col. i. 24.

sense, for he elsewhere denies that any one except Christ alone, is crucified for us;* he suffered for the church in the second sense, as he himself teaches us, 2 Cor. v. 6. "*for your consolation.*" In 2 Tim. ii. 10. he says that he endures all things for the elect's sake, not to redeem them from temporal punishment, but that confirmed, and animated by his example, they might obtain salvation by Christ. The remark made by Thomas† on this subject, is a correct one. "*The sufferings of the saints are profitable to the church, not as a price of redemption, but as affording it example, and exhortation not to depart from the truth.*"

Paul says,‡ "*that he fills up that which is behind of the sufferings of Christ.*" But the sufferings of the saints are not the sufferings endured by Christ in his own person; but the sufferings of Christ mystical, or of his body, the church; sufferings, which are to be endured by every Christian, after the manner of Christ, whose members they are. Paul, as well as all other saints, had to take up his cross and follow Christ, and endure that share of tribulation which God allotted him, while he was entering upon the kingdom of heaven. In filling up this measure of tribulation, the apostle bears his cross with alacrity. Christ is often thus by a figure put for his body, the church; "*Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me.*"§ The sufferings of the saints are often called the sufferings of Christ;‖ "*For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us.*" They are called so in relation to their origin, because Christ, as supreme director of the theatre of life, appoints them to us, and calls upon us to suffer them;¶ in relation to their object, for they are laid upon us on account of Christ and his gospel;—also on account of our union and communion with Christ, for we are one with him. Hence our blessings and sufferings are in some sense common to us and Christ. "*In all their afflictions he was afflicted.*" We are called to participate in his sufferings, that we

* 1 Cor. i. 13.
‡ Col. i. 24.
‖ 2 Cor. i. 5.
† 3. Quest. 48. Art. 5.
§ Acts ix. 4. and 1 Cor. xii. 12.
¶ Acts ix. 16. 1 Pet. ii. 25. Phil. i. 29.

may be conformed to him in his cross, before we are conformed to him in his glory.*

It is one thing for a person to atone for his sins, by a real satisfaction, another to break off his sins by works of repentance and charity. It is in the latter sense that Daniel† advises Nebuchadnezzar to break off his sins. The Hebrew word פרק, used by the prophet here, does not primarily signify to redeem, nor even to deliver; its primary sense is to tear away, or break off; and hence, as a collateral signification, it imports, to deliver. The prophet exhorts the Syrian king to repentance, and a change of life, in order to make reparation to men and not to God, for the injuries which he had done, and the oppressions which he had practised; and that by thus breaking off his course of sinning, he might be more prosperous, escape from the ruin which was hanging over him, and obtain a longer continuance of peace in his empire. To the same purpose are all those places of scripture, in which pardon of sin is promised to repentance. The repentance is not a meritorious cause, but a condition annexed, the medium through which pardon is obtained. As our prayers are not a price, which we pay to God in advance for the blessings which we seek, but a mean which God has appointed for obtaining those favours which he bestows freely.

Sufferings are of two kinds. One is that in which they are exacted by a judge to make satisfaction to justice; the other, that in which they are inflicted for the correction of the offender. We admit, that the latter species of suffering is often appointed to believers, not for vengeance, but for healing; not for destruction, but for correction. God lays it upon them, not as a judge, but as a father; not out of hatred, but out of love. Cyprian says, "*The Lord chastises the saints that he may advance their holiness, and he advances their holiness, that he may save them.*" To the same purpose Thomas speaks.‡ "*Before pardon, the sufferings of the*

* Rom. viii. 28.

† Dan. iv. 27.

‡ 3. Q. 96.

elect are punishments for sin; after pardon, they are exercises." Augustin happily explains* the difference between the punishments of the wicked, and the chastisements of the saints. He speaks thus:—" All, both good and evil, suffer the same afflictions; nor by their afflictions can we distinguish between the righteous and the wicked; for all things happen alike to all, there is one lot to the righteous and to the wicked. There is, however, a distinction between the persons who suffer punishment. All who are subjected to the same pains, are not alike vicious or virtuous. In the same fire, gold shines and stubble smokes; by the same fan the chaff is blown away, and the wheat purged. Dregs must not be confounded with oil, because both are pressed in the same press. The very same afflictions which prove, purify, and refine the righteous, are a curse, and destruction to the wicked. Hence, under the pressure of the same calamities, the wicked detest and blaspheme God, while the righteous pray to him, and praise him. Thus the difference is not in the nature of the punishments, but in the character of those who suffer them."

The chastisements which the saints experience, sometimes indeed, retain the name punishments, but not in a strict sense. 1. Because punishments, in a strict sense, are inflicted by the supreme Judge upon transgressing men, on account of their violation of his law. Hence, even after the state of a man is changed, and he becomes a saint, the pains and griefs which he suffers are called by the same name, because, though not formally, they are materially the same. 2. Because there are many points of resemblance between them and punishments properly so called. They are not joyous but grievous to the flesh, which they are designed, no less than proper punishments, to subdue. They are dispensed to the saints, by the will of a gracious God, with as much care and attention, as he, in the character of an avenging judge, dispenses punishments. Sin gives occasion both to chastisements and punishments.—They agree some-

* De Civ. Dei. lib. i. cap. 8.

times in the apprehension which they produce in the mind, that God is an angry judge, and they both serve as an example salutary to offenders. But this grand difference still remains, that is, in the punishments of the wicked, God, as a judge, has in view satisfaction to his justice; while in the chastisements of his people, he, as a father, designs the correction and amendment of his disobedient children.

The death of David's child, which affliction happened to him after the pardon of his sin,* was not a satisfactory and judicial punishment, but a fatherly chastisement; for his sin having been once pardoned, no punishment could remain to be borne. The reason which God assigns for thus afflicting the king of Israel, gives no countenance to the idea, that the affliction was judicial and expiatory. By his sin, he had given occasion to the enemy to blaspheme the name of God, and thus the discipline of the house of God had been most basely violated. This breach of discipline must be healed by a salutary example. Nor can we infer that it was judicial, from David's deprecating it. It is the part of human nature to avoid, and endeavour to free itself of whatever is painful, like a sick man who deprecates the caustic powders, the pain of the amputating knife, and the bitterness of medicine, though nothing can be further from the nature of punishment than these.

Though death cannot be inflicted upon us to guard us against future transgression, nor for our amendment, yet it by no means follows, that it is designed as an atonement for sin. There are many other weighty reasons, rendering it necessary that all should die; such as, that the remains of sin may be destroyed—that we may pass from an animal and terrestrial state, to one spiritual and heavenly—that piety may be exercised—that Christian virtues may be displayed in the most brilliant manner—and finally, that it may be a most powerful excitement to amend our life, look out for a better inheritance, and be prepared for entering upon its enjoyment.

* 2 Sam. xii. 14.

The judgment, which the apostle Peter tells us, must begin at the house of God,* is not the legal judgment of avenging justice, which proceeds from God as a wrathful judge, but a fatherly and evangelical chastisement; not to punish and destroy, but to hold out a useful example, and to correct us, that thus we may not be condemned with the world. It is similar to that which Paul speaks of, 1 Cor. xi. 32. The punishment mentioned 2 Cor. vii. 11. is not properly a punishment inflicted by God in the character of judge, but either an ecclesiastical censure, such as excommunication, which is adjudged by the church for the removal of scandal; or it rather denotes repentance and contrition, in which a sinner is offended with himself, and for some crime which he has committed, afflicts his soul.

Though those under the Old Testament dispensation whose sins were pardoned, had still to offer sacrifices for sin, yet a warrant for attempting to make human atonements is not thence to be inferred. The sacrifices then offered were not, properly speaking, propitiatory offerings. They were types of a future atonement to be made by Christ, through the efficacy of which they received pardon.

When Solomon says,† that "*by mercy and truth iniquity is purged*," no countenance is given to the human satisfaction for which the church of Rome contends, for he does not deny, but rather supposes the atonement made by Christ. There are two opinions maintained respecting this passage; one is, that by "*mercy and truth*" are meant, the mercy and truth of God: then the wise man would directly allude to, and assert the atonement of Christ. The other opinion is, that the mercy and truth of man are intended; then the doctrine which the text teaches would be, that mercy and truth are a condition always required when sin is pardoned, but not the cause for which the sentence of pardon is pronounced, because, against the unmerciful, judgment without mercy will be exercised. On the other hand,‡ "*the merciful shall obtain mercy*."

* 1 Pet. iv. 17. † Prov. xvi. 6. ‡ Matt. v. 6.

The Hebrew word כפר which is here translated "purged," does not properly signify expiatory purging, but either covering and remission only, which God bestows on the believing —on the merciful; or it signifies the removal of a sense of sin. In this sense it is used by the prophet Isaiah.* Then the passage would intimate that the exercise of mercy and sincere piety removes the contrary vices. The following clause of the verse confirms this interpretation of the word; "*by the fear of the Lord men depart from evil.*"

Though nothing defiled can enter into the New Jerusalem, yet there is no need of any satisfaction in this life, beside that of Christ, nor of a purgatory in another, to purge away the pollutions of sin; for in the moment of death, when the soul is separated from the body, all the remains of sin are entirely removed by the spirit of Christ.

* Isa. xxviii. 18.

CHAPTER III.

On the Substance of the Atonement.

Concerning the matter and parts of the satisfaction, various opinions have been embraced by divines. Some limit it to the sufferings and punishments which he endured for us. This opinion appears to have been first maintained by Cargius, a Lutheran minister, and after him to have been adopted by Piscator, a reformed professor at Herborne. Some of the divines, who have embraced this opinion, confine that righteousness by which we are justified to the death which he suffered; while others of them comprehend in it also all the sufferings of his life. This they call his passive righteousness. The obedience which he yielded to the precepts of the law, they term his active righteousness, which they suppose to have been necessary in the person of the Mediator to the performance of his mediatory functions. They maintain, however, that it forms no part of his atonement, or his merits, which are imputed to us.

The opinion, commonly received in our churches, is that the atonement made by Christ, which is imputed to us for righteousness before God, is not confined to the sufferings, which he endured either in his life or at his death, but that it extends to the obedience of his whole life, to all those just and holy actions, by which he perfectly obeyed the law in our stead. From these two parts—his sufferings and his obedience, they maintain that the full and perfect price of our redemption proceeds.

In order to ascertain precisely the state of the question,

we remark that the subject of controversy is not, whether Christ perfectly fulfilled both the general law, binding to worship God, and the special law commanding him to submit to death. Again, it is not whether the obedience of Christ's whole life was for promotion of our interests, and necessary to the procurement of our salvation. Both are granted by our opponents. They acknowledge that he fulfilled both laws, that the obedience of his life was necessary for him, in the performance of his mediatory duties, and in many respects profitable for us. We enquire whether this obedience forms a part of the satisfaction, which he made to God for us—whether it was yielded in our stead.

Again, the enquiry is not, whether the mere sufferings belong to the satisfaction. For those, whose opinion we controvert, acknowledge that no suffering can be of an atoning nature, unless it be of an active character, voluntarily endured. They also admit that, in order to its being acceptable to God, it must have included active obedience, and voluntary oblation, which should embrace the perfection of charity, together with the most perfect righteousness and immaculate holiness. They even say that the observance of the whole law was condensed into one action, that of Christ's death. We enquire whether the obedience which Christ through his life yielded to the law, is to be joined to the obedience which he yielded in his death and sufferings, in order to constitute our justifying righteousness before God. We must distinguish between what Christ did directly and immediately to make an atonement, and what only pertained, as previous conditions, to the making of the atonement. In this last we place the personal holiness of Christ.

Hence the question is reduced to this point; is the atonement which Christ made for us restricted to his death alone, or at least to all those sufferings, which were either antecedent to his death, or accompanied it? Or does it comprehend all which Christ did and suffered for us, from the beginning to the end of his life? The former is the opinion of

Cargius, Piscator, and their followers; the latter is our opinion and that of our churches generally.

In order to understand more clearly the doctrine for which we contend, we shall make the following remarks. I. That the atoning sufferings of Christ extend to all those which were inflicted upon him, not only in the garden of Gethsemane, but also to those which he bore during his whole life. We cannot approve of the hypothesis, which restricts the expiatory sufferings of our Redeemer to the pains he suffered during the three hours in which the sun was darkened, and he hung on the cross before his death; while it excludes all the other sufferings of his life, as, at most, only necessary to vindicate the truth of God, and to accomplish the typical representations of Christ under the law. We admit indeed, that the greatest agonies of Christ were those to which he was exposed during those hours of darkness. But it is abundantly evident, that all his other sufferings were expiatory:—1. Because the scripture no where restricts his expiation to the three hours, in which the sun was darkened, but refers it, in general to his sufferings, without any limitation.* They even extend it to his whole humiliation.† 2. Because the agonies which he endured in the garden, and which are expressed by the words *grief, sorrow, agony, heaviness, amazement, and being exceeding sorrowful even unto death*, on account of the tremendous weight of divine wrath and malediction, were the chief sufferings which Christ had to endure in his soul for us. 3. This opinion, which we oppose, wrests from many pious Christians one great means of consolation. In the sufferings of Christ's whole life, as expiatory, they find rest to their souls. This idle imagination of Cargius and Piscator, would snatch from Christians all this solace, and deprive them of innumerable evidences of the divine love.

The objection which is brought against this reasoning from Jer. iii. 9. "*I will remove the iniquity of that land in*

* Isa. liii. 4, 5. 1 Pet. ii. 21. & iii. 18. Matt. xvi. 21. Heb. v. 7. & x. 8, 9.
† Phil. ii. 6, 7.

one day," is of no avail. That, from these words of the apostle, "*We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus once for all*," is equally unsubstantial*. The inference to be drawn from these texts is not that the sufferings of Christ, antecedent to those on the cross, are not expiatory; but only that the atonement was consummated on the cross. In consequence of this consummation all the sins of all the elect were, in one day, blotted out. The reason why the apostle, by a figure common in all languages, refers the expiation of our sins to the one offering of Christ is, that his sufferings on the cross were the last and most piercing, without which all his antecedent sufferings would have been insufficient; as the payment of the last farthing completes the liquidation of the debt, and cancels the bond. Because he was inaugurated into his mediatory office, in the thirtieth year of his age, we may not thence infer, that previously to that time, he was neither a priest nor a victim; for by the same mode of reasoning, it would follow, that before thirty years of age he was not a Mediator. That Christ was in favour with God, that he was his well-beloved Son, nay, that he was sometimes in his life glorified, does not prove that he did not then bear the divine wrath. These two are not at all incompatible with each other. Christ, viewed in himself, never ceased to be most dearly beloved of his Father, not even in his excruciating tortures on the accursed tree, though, as our surety, he bore the load of the divine wrath, and was made a curse for us. It was not necessary that the punishments which Christ underwent should be so intense, that they could admit of no alleviations by which he might be animated to encounter gloriously that dreadful conflict, which was set before him.

II. We remark that in the actions and sufferings of Christ two things are to be considered—their substance and their form. They are considered, in relation to their substance, when we examine their nature and intensity. The same actions and sufferings are considered formally when they are

* Heb. x. 10.

examined as constituting a righteousness to be sustained before the tribunal of God. In the former light the actions and sufferings are many and various. In the second view of them they are to be considered under one form only, that of producing a whole, composed of all his actions and passions—a one and perfect righteousness: Whereas one action or passion alone cannot be said to effect a full atonement, because it is necessary that a perfect obedience should be connected with it. Hence, although various degrees and acts may be remarked in the obedience of Christ, which commenced at his birth, was continued through his life, and completed at his death, yet it is unique, as to the completion of the work of salvation, and the righteousness which it accomplishes.

III. We remark that there is in the obedience of Christ a twofold efficacy. The one is expiatory, that by which we are freed from those punishments, to which we were liable on account of sin. The other is a meritorious efficacy, by which through the remission of our sins, a title to eternal life and salvation, has been acquired for us. For as sin has brought upon us two evils—the loss of life, and exposure to death; so redemption must procure two benefits—liberation from death, and a title to life: or, deliverance from hell and an introduction into heaven. To this purpose various passages of scripture are pertinent; which clearly express those two benefits. "*To make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in an everlasting righteousness.*"* "*Christ hath redeemed us from the law being made a curse for us—that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles.*"† "*God sent forth his Son—to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.*"‡ "*We were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life.*"§ "*That they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified.*"‖

* Dan. ix. 24. † Gal. iii. 13, 14. ‡ Ibid. iv. 4.
§ Rom. v. 10. ‖ Acts, xxvi. 18.

These two blessings, indeed, which flow from the obedience of Christ, are indissolubly connected in the covenant of grace, so that no one who obtains the pardon of sin can fail of acquiring a right to life. These, however, must be distinguished, and not confounded as if they were one and and the same thing. It is one thing to free from death, another to introduce into life—one thing to deliver from hell, another to conduct into heaven—one thing to free from punishment, another to bestow rewards. Though it is true that no one is freed from death, who is not also made a partaker of life, yet it does not follow that a deliverance from the death which we deserve, is not to be distinguished from the acquisition of glory. There are many grades of life as well as of holiness. The possession of life does, indeed, follow liberation from death, but it is not necessary that this life should be a happy and glorious one; as liberty follows deliverance from prison, but it may be liberty without a throne and a diadem. Joseph might have been freed from prison and not set over the land of Egypt. Between death and life simply there is no medium, but between eternal death, and a life happy and glorious, there is a medium—the life of bondage in which man is now placed. The present life, in which man is bound to the performance of duty, is a state of pilgrimage, not a state of heavenly rest.

While we believe it necessary to make distinctions such as these, we think it improper to enquire curiously, as some do, by what particular acts, Christ made atonement, and by what he merited life for us. Those who make these too nice distinctions, attribute the atonement to his sufferings; and the acquisition of a right to life, they attribute to his active obedience to the law. These distinctions receive no countenance from scripture, which no where distinguishes the obedience of Christ into parts, but, on the contrary, represents it as a thing unique, by which he hath done in our place every thing which the law requires of us. As Christ, by the obedience of his life, has rendered to the law what it required of us, and to which we are otherwise bound; so by this obedience he has satisfied the law, as to those de-

mands which it makes upon us: and hence his active obedience partakes of the nature of satisfaction. Again, as his passive obedience proceeded from unspeakable love to us, and as love is the fulfilling of the law, we cannot deny but it was meritorious, and of the nature of a price of redemption, by which a right to life has been acquired for us. Therefore, we should avoid those curious distinctions, and consider liberation from death, and our right to life as flowing from all the mediatory duties, which Christ performed during his humiliation,—and all these considered as a perfect whole are called the obedience of Christ. Sin could not be expiated before the law was fulfilled, nor could a right to life be acquired, before the charges preferred against us on account of sin were blotted out. Christ merited by making atonement, and by meriting he made atonement. Unspeakable were his merits, in doing what was most difficult and arduous, for our redemption. This, his perfect obedience accomplished, and, in accomplishing it, gave the most unequivocal proof of his great love to us; by delivering himself up to his Father to die in the room of sinners: he satisfied the demands of a special law, and fulfilled the duties required by his own vocation by all the things which he performed, and which should have been of no avail to us had they not been sealed and consummated by his death. The atonement is not to be ascribed merely to the external shedding of his blood, but also, and principally, to an internal act—his spontaneous and unchangeable willingness to suffer even to the death of the cross for us. By this voluntary offering of himself, we are said to be sanctified.* It is not to be ascribed to the payment of the last farthing, but to the whole of the price of redemption, which is Christ, delivering up and subjecting himself for us.

The objection which Socinus offers against this is of no force. "He says, that atonement and merit are incompatible with each other, for satisfaction or atonement is the payment of a just debt, whereas merit is effected by giving some thing not due on the score of justice." This is accu-

* Heb. x. 14.

rate when applied to a satisfaction or payment made by a debtor in his own person, but it has no application when referred to a vicarious satisfaction, in which a surety, while making satisfaction may merit some thing, both in relation to the debtor, and the creditor:—in relation to the debtor, by paying, when under no obligation to do so, a debt for him, and thus graciously freeing him from all obligation to the creditor:—in relation to the creditor he may merit, and this especially if a covenant has been made, in which it is stipulated that upon making a specified payment, it shall be admitted not only as a satisfaction for sin, but as procuring a title to blessings not otherwise due. This is the case here, as appears from Isa. liii. 10. Heb. ix. 15. Col. i. 17, 20. and from similar passages.

IV. We remark, that there are two things contained in the law. There are precepts, which prescribe duties; and sanctions, which ordain rewards to those who keep the law; and punishments to its transgressors. Man who is under the obligation of the law, may be at the same time bound both to obedience, and punishment. This, however, cannot take place in a state of primitive rectitude, but in a state of sin. Because sinful man sustains a twofold relation to God—one the relation of a creature, the other that of a sinful, and condemned creature. In regard to the former he always owes obedience to God, and can never be freed from this obligation so long as he continues a creature, no matter what situation he may be in. In respect to the latter he is obnoxious to punishment. Yet we cannot infer from this doctrine that man pays his debt twice to God. A penal debt is very different from a debt of obedience. A penal debt arises from past transgressions; a debt of obedience, from the indispensable obligation of the creature to obey the Creator, is coextensive with the whole term of its existence, and neither is, nor can be relaxed, even while the creature is suffering the punishment of its transgressions.

V. We remark that there is a threefold subjection to the law—a natural, a federal and a penal subjection. The natural subjection arises from the law as a rule of holiness, and respects the creature as a creature. It is eternal and in-

dispensable, because in every situation, the creature is bound to be subject to God, and to obey him. The federal subjection arises from the law as prescribing a condition, upon the fulfilment of which, a reward is to be attained; respects the creature as placed in a covenant state; and prescribes the performance of duty under the promise of rewards and punishments. The penal subjection respects the creature as placed in a state of sin and condemnation, and binds him to suffer the punishment which the law denounces. The first is absolute and immutable; for as long as there is a creature, and a Creator, the creature must be subject to the Creator. God can no more dispense with his claim of subjection upon the creature than he can deny himself. The second is economical and changeable, because it respects man not in a natural, but in a constituted state, it continues in force as long as man continues in that state, and no longer. So soon as he has finished his probation, and by fulfilling the condition, has obtained the reward, he is freed from this subjection. The third is necessary, and inevitable, whenever the creature falls into sin, which is necessarily followed by punishment. The first is founded in a right essential to God—in that natural, underived and necessary authority, which he has a right to exercise over the creature,—and the natural dependence of the creature upon him. The second is founded in the sovereign pleasure of God; it results from, and depends upon the will of Deity, whereby he has been pleased to enter into a covenant with his creature, and promise it life under this, or that condition. The third is founded in the judicial authority, and avenging justice of God; and by it he avenges the transgressions of his creature. "Vengeance is mine," saith God, "and I will repay." All creatures, angels, and men, are under the natural subjection to the law. Adam, in a state of innocence, was under the federal subjection. Devils and reprobate men are under the penal subjection.

In this third respect, it is easy to conceive how Christ was subjected to the law—"*Made under the law*," as the apostle expresses it; and whether he was subjected to the

law for himself or for us. As a man there is no doubt but he was subject to the law for himself as a rule of holiness,* by a common and natural subjection, under which angels and glorified saints are in heaven, who love God and are bound to worship him. But it does not follow from this that he was subject to the law as exhibiting a condition of happiness —that his subjection was a federal subjection, binding him to obtain life by fulfilling a condition. This he must of necessity obtain by the hypostatical union. Much less was he subjected to the law for himself, by a penal subjection, for he was most holy, and absolutely free from all sin. So that when he undertook the twofold office of fulfilling the precepts of the law, and suffering its sanction; all this was to be done in consequence of a voluntary arrangement, by which he as Mediator, engaged to perform them for us. He voluntarily entered into a covenant with his Father, to do and suffer as our surety all those things, which the law claimed of us, and which were necessary to our redemption.

These remarks being premised in order to an accurate understanding of the subject; we shall now proceed to offer proofs in support of the opinion which we embrace. It is confirmed from many passage of scripture. The first which we shall adduce is Rom. v. 19. "*For as by the disobedience of one many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one, are many made righteous.*" Here the atonement is referred to his obedience, not to that of his death, but also that of his life. 1. Because the apostle treats of his whole obedience, without any limitation; hence this obedience

* Witsius, the elegant author of the Economy of the Covenants, as well as Mr. Turrettin and President Edwards, takes this view of the obligations of Christ as a creature. But as Mr. Turrettin says the human nature of Christ is only an adjunct of his divine person, he could owe no obedience for himself. It is a person only, who is the subject of the moral law, and the person of Christ is the second person of the trinity, who is Lord of the law. His humility is every where in scripture represented as voluntary. Had he been subject to the law for himself he could not have performed an obedience for others. Those great divines rather express themselves loosely than erroneously; not foreseeing the bad use which men of subtle and unsound mind would make of their inaccurate phrases.

must be perfect, and continued from the beginning of his life to the end. An incomplete obedience will not suit the language here used by the Spirit. 2. He treats concerning an obedience, which imports universal conformity to the law, not only with respect to the penal sanction, but also, and indeed chiefly, with respect to observing its precepts. 3. He treats of what is called, v. 17. the "*gift of righteousness*," which cannot be applied to the sufferings of Christ. 4. He speaks of an obedience which is opposed to the disobedience of Adam; and as the disobedience of Adam was a violation of the whole law, so the obedience of Christ must be a fulfilment of the whole law. 5. Of an obedience which was due from us both as to precept, and penalty. It will be of no avail to object, "that the obedience is nothing else than the one righteousness mentioned verse 18, and which is said to be to justification of life, and that the condemnation of sin under which we have fallen arose from one sinful act of Adam." The righteousness spoken of here does not intend one act of righteousness; it denotes a righteousness effected by a complete and perfect obedience, —a fulfilment of all righteousness. Nor, though the offence came upon all from one sin, can the righteousness be derived to all from one act; because the least failure in performing the demands of the law is sin: whereas goodness requires a perfect course, righteousness requires the fulfilment of the whole law.

The obedience of Christ is said to have been *even to death*,* in which not only its intensity as to degree is expressed—an intensity the greatest which can be rendered by any one; but also its extension and duration, from the beginning of his life to its end. This appears from his obedience being referred to the whole of his humiliation, which appeared not in his death only, but in his whole life. In other portions of scripture, the obedience of Christ is described by the writing of the law in his heart,† and his active observance of it.‡ Again it is spoken of as a race

* Phil. ii. 8. † Psal. xl. Heb. x. 5.

which Christ had to run,* and as a work which he had to perform.† These were not to be performed by one act, but by a constant tenor of obedience through his whole life.

It behoved Christ to be made in the likeness of sinful flesh, that he might supply what the law could not do, in that it was weak, and fulfil the claims of the law in us.‡ This weakness of the law is not to be understood subjectively, as if it were in the law, but objectively, as in the sinner, in relation to the law; on account of his inability to perform any of the duties which it commands. This law is said to be weak, not in relation to the infliction of punishment, but as to the observation of its precepts. Christ, therefore, by supplying what the law could not do in us, must fulfil all the law demanded of us, and work out what the apostle calls "righteousness," or the rights of the law, without doubt a right to life, obtained by doing what the law commands. This required not only a passive, but also an active obedience. For seeing the law and commands of God are the same, punishments cannot be said to fulfil the law, or, which is the same thing, its commands. They satisfy it as to its denunciations only. Who would say that a malefactor, who had been capitally punished for his crimes, had obeyed the king or the law? To act agreeably to law is a good and praiseworthy thing, which cannot be asserted respecting the suffering of punishment, *per se*, unless it will be asserted, that he is to be applauded who suffers the punishments of hell.

We argue, in favour of extending the atonement to the active obedience of Christ, from his being bound to all that the law required of us, in order to acquire a title to life; to which obedience of life was no less requisite than the suffering of death; because the sinful creature is bound to both these, and both were necessary to the obtaining of pardon, and a right to life. In the law, life is not promised to him who suffers its penalties, but to him who performs

* Heb. xii. 1. † John xvii. 4.
‡ Rom. viii. 3, 4.

the duties which it enjoins. "*Do this and thou shalt live.*" Hence, to undergo the penalty by dying, was not sufficient, without the obeying of the precepts. Let it not here be objected, "that there is a difference between evangelical and legal justification,—that in the latter a perfect obedience to the law is requisite, but not in the former." The difference of our justification now, under the gospel, from that under the covenant of works, is not placed in the thing itself, but in the manner in which we obtain it. Justification, whether legal, or evangelical, must be founded on a righteousness, perfect, absolutely perfect, in all its parts,—a righteousness which shall comply with all the conditions that the law imposes for the purpose of obtaining eternal life—a righteousness, which shall answer to the eternal and immutable claims of God upon the creature. These were conditions, these were qualities in that righteousness, by which we were to be justified, that could not be dispensed with even in Christ; "for he came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it."* Our justification is indeed, an evangelical justification, and comes to us in a different manner. What the law demanded of us as a perfect righteousness to be wrought out in our own persons, has been wrought by another, even by Christ, in our stead.

We infer, that the active obedience of Christ is comprehended in that atonement which he made for sin, from the atonement's being founded in his righteousness, as appears from various passages of scripture.† Whence justification is said‡ to be effected by the imputation of righteousness. And the righteousness of Christ does not consist in his suffering, but in his doing. This righteousness of the law is not obtained by suffering, but by doing, even as the sentence of condemnation is pronounced for sinning. Christ testifies, that it "*became him to fulfil all righteousness,*"§ by doing in every thing the will of his Father; and Paul says,

* Matt. v. 17. and Rom. iii. 31.
† Rom. i. 17. and iii. 21. and viii. 18. Phil. iii. 2. Dan. ii. 24.
‡ Rom. iv. § Matt. xiii. 15.

"*that Christ was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.*"* By which it is to be understood, that, as those sins which violated the law, were imputed to Christ, so his righteous actions, by which he fulfilled the law, are imputed to us for a justifying righteousness.

The same doctrine is established from 1 Cor. i. 13.; where it is said, that "*Christ is not divided.*" Hence, we infer that his righteousness is not to be divided, but as a whole, and unique inheritance, it is to be bestowed on us. The paschal lamb was to be eaten whole; and, in like manner, Christ, who was typically represented by that lamb, is to be received by us in all his mediatorial fulness, both as to what he did and suffered. This view of the subject attributes greater glory to Christ, and presents richer fountains of consolation. This consolation is greatly diminished by those who take away from the price of our redemption a part of his perfect righteousness, and most holy obedience, and thus rend his seamless coat.

We shall now proceed to the removal of objections. If our redemption and salvation are attributed to the death and blood of Christ, this is not done to the exclusion of the obedience of his life; for such a restriction is no where mentioned in scripture. On the contrary, the work of man's salvation, is, in many places, as shewn above, attributed to the obedience and righteousness of Christ. When the death or blood of Christ is mentioned alone, and our redemption ascribed to it, this is done by a synechdoche, a figure, which puts a part for the whole. The reason is, that his death was the lowest degree of his humiliation, and the completion of his obedience,—that which supposes all the other parts, and without which they would have been of no avail. No righteousness merits any thing unless it is persevered in to the last breath; a payment is never perfectly made, until the last farthing is paid, and the bond cancelled.

Though the apostle Paul attributes† the glorification of

* 2 Cor. v. 21.

† Rom. xvi. 7.

the saints to the remission of sin which flows from the blood of Christ, yet it does not follow from this, that all our righteousness, and the whole of the satisfaction made by Christ, are founded in his passion. Because the apostle does not argue from the pardon of sin's being precisely equivalent to glorification, and its proceeding precisely from the same thing in the atonement, but from the indissoluble connection among the blessings of the new covenant, a connection so intimate, that every one who obtains pardon of sin, necessarily and immediately obtains a right to life, and becomes an heir of the kingdom of heaven. In the same way Paul treats of love to our neighbour, and the fulfilling of the whole law, as the same thing;* because when love to our neighbour exists, all the other duties of the law will necessarily be performed.

Though each obedience of Christ, as well that of his life as of his death, was perfect in its kind, yet neither of them alone was a sufficient satisfaction, which required the observance of precepts as well as the suffering of punishments, that liberation from death, and a right to life might be procured. One does not exclude the other, nay, they mutually embrace each other.

What one person owes for himself, he cannot pay for another, if he be a private person. But nothing prevents such a payment, when the person is a public character, who may act both in his own name, and in the name of those whom he represents. He who pays what he owes for himself, cannot by the same thing make a payment for others, unless he has voluntarily made himself a debtor for them, in which case he can. For, although he may be a debtor, yet this character arises from his own voluntary act,—the debt which he has to pay for himself, is a debt, which, were it not for his own voluntary deed, he is not bound to pay, and hence, while he is paying for himself, he may, by the same act, pay for another. So Christ, who became man, not for his own sake, but for our sakes, was under no obligation to

* Gal. v. 14.

fulfil the law in order to merit life for himself; but, to merit it for us, he was under obligation to keep the law. Though Christ, as a creature, was naturally subject to the law, yet he was not under it by a covenant and œconomical subjection, binding him to obtain life for himself, but that he should stand as a surety in the room of sinners; and this last arose from a voluntary agreement entered into between him and his Father. In an œconomical sense, he owed nothing for himself, because he is the Son of God, and Lord of the law. As to his human nature, he was not thus bound either absolutely or partially. Not absolutely, for his human nature was an adjunct of his divine person, which was not subject to the law. He could not be thus subject to the law, for his assumption of human nature was a part of his humiliation; hence, in relation to those duties which flow from his humiliation, his obligation to discharge them was a covenant obligation. He could not, in respect of his human nature, be subject to the law as procuring for himself life; because, as man he was not bound by the old covenant obligation to discharge those duties, which belonged to those whom Adam represented, and who were naturally descended from him. From all which I infer, that he was under no obligations to perform the duties of the law to acquire for himself a right to life; which right, of necessity results from the connection of his human nature with the Logos,—the second person of the Trinity. Hence also I infer, that Christ owed all his covenant obedience for us, and this in the character of a surety who represented us.

Though Christ obeyed God in our room we cannot thence infer, that we are no longer bound to obedience in our own persons. It is indeed fairly to be inferred, that we are not bound to obey for the same end, and by the same kind of subjection—to obtain life by the performance of duties, to which we are bound by covenant obligation. Yet we may be, and we are, in perfect consistency with the obedience of Christ for us, bound by a natural obligation to yield the same obedience to God, not that we may obtain life, but because we have obtained it—not that we may acquire a right to the en-

joyments of heaven, but that, having through Christ, obtained a title to them, we may be prepared for entering upon the enjoyment of them. Hence though Christ has died for us, we are still obnoxious to natural death, not, however, for a punishment, but for a deliverance from the evils of this life, and an introduction into heaven.

We must distinguish between a righteousness of innocence, which takes place, when one is accused of no fault, and a righteousness of perseverance, to which a reward is due for duties done. The pardon of sin produces the former kind of righteousness, by taking away every accusation on account of sins committed; but it does not of necessity so produce the latter, that he who obtains it, must be forthwith adjudged to have performed all duties. It is one thing to free a person from punishment which is due to the omission of duty; another to account him really righteous, with the righteousness of perseverance, to which life is promised, and to view him as having omitted no duty, and done no evil. The former of these is obtained in the day of pardon, but not the latter; which would be contrary to truth and the just judgment of God. Pardon does not remove sin, but prevents its imputation. He who is pardoned may commit sin, and he does commit sin; but in consequence of the pardon which he has obtained, it shall not be imputed to him for condemnation. Pardon takes away the guilt only, and consequently its punishment, but does not take away its pollution. Thus, to be viewed as having done no sin, and as having omitted no duty, can be understood in a twofold sense. 1. In relation to punishment—that we can no more be punished than if we had in reality committed no sin, and omitted no duty; because we are freed from all that punishment, which is due to sin. 2. In relation to the obtaining of reward—that he who is esteemed to have performed all duty, and avoided all sin, shall be judged by God to have done all things which are necessary to life. In this latter sense, it is not true, that he whose sins are remitted, is to be esteemed free from all sin; for, as was remarked above, pardon takes away punishment; but God is not, by the sentence of

pardon which he pronounces, bound to hold the sinner as free from all delinquency, as having fulfilled all his duty, and as a perfectly just person. This is not true in fact. The judge is not bound to esteem an accused person righteous, because, through supplication and confession, he has obtained pardon.

It cannot be said, that God demands a double payment of the same debt; because the law binds the sinner both to obedience and punishment, as is said above; and the actions and sufferings of Christ do not constitute a double payment; they, both together, constitute one payment—one unique righteousness, by which deliverance from death, and a right to life have been acquired for us.

A perfect fulfilment of the law cannot be said to have been condensed into the voluntary death of Christ; for the law demands perfect obedience, as to all its several precepts, and this not in degree only, but in duration, from the beginning to the end of life; all which cannot be accomplished in one action.

So far is the whole of Christ's righteousness, which is imputed to us, from being placed in his sufferings, and hence called active, that, strictly speaking, no righteousness is placed in suffering, but in doing only. No one can be called righteous, merely because he suffers, for misery is not virtue. Besides, sufferings yield no obedience to those commands of the law, to which life is promised; they only satisfy its sanctions, and cannot be called, *per se*, righteousness. If there is any righteousness in punishment, it belongs to the person who inflicts the punishment, and not to him who is punished.

Calvin, in many parts of his works, teaches the doctrine for which we contend. Take the following passages.* "When it is asked how by the removal of sin, Christ hath taken away the enmity between God and us; and brought in a righteousness, which hath made God our friend? It may be answered in general, that he has done this by the whole course of his obedience. This is proved by the testimony of

* Inst. book ii. cap. 16. sec. 5.

Paul, '*as by the transgression of one, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one, many were made righteous.*' Elsewhere, "the ground of pardon—that which delivers us from the curse of the law, the same apostle extends to the whole of Christ's life. '*When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law.*' Even in his baptism, God declares, that Christ had fulfilled a part of this righteousness—that he had done his will. Finally, from the time that '*he took upon himself the form of a servant,*' he began to pay the price of our redemption. Nevertheless, that the scripture may define more precisely, the manner in which salvation is procured, it ascribes peculiarly, the price of redemption to the death of Christ." He afterwards adds, "yet the remaining part of his obedience which he performed during his life is not excluded; for the apostle comprehends the whole of his obedience from the beginning of his life to the end, when he says, that '*he humbled himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was obedient to his Father unto death, even the death of the cross.*' Indeed, his death occupies the first grade in his voluntary subjection; because, a sacrifice availed nothing, unless it was offered freely." Elsewhere, he remarks,* that, "accepting grace, is nothing else but his unmerited goodness, by which the Father embraces us in Christ, clothes us with his innocence, causing us to accept it, that on account of it, he may esteem us holy, pure and innocent. It behooves the righteousness of Christ, which alone is perfect, and will stand in the sight of God, to be presented for us, and as a righteousness offered by our surety, to be set to our account in the judgment. Ornamented by this, we, through faith, obtain perpetual remission of sin. By its immaculate purity, all our defilements are washed away: they are not laid to our account—before the splendour of Emmanuel's righteousness, our pollutions are banished, and flee away, never more to rise against us in judgment."

* Inst. book iii. cap. 14. sec. 12.

The Gallic Synods, by repeated acts, have given their most explicit testimony in favour of the same truth.* "When man can find in himself, either before or after effectual calling, no righteousness, by which he can stand before the tribunal of God; he cannot be justified unless in our Lord Jesus Christ, who was obedient to God the Father, even from his entrance into the world, until his ignominious death on the cross. In his life, and at his death, he fulfilled the whole law given to man—the command to suffer and lay down his life, a price of redemption for many. By the perfect obedience of Christ, we are rendered righteous; for through the goodness of God it is imputed to us, and received by faith, which is the gift of God. We by the merit of the whole of this obedience, obtain remission of our sins, and are rendered worthy of eternal life."

* Privatensis Synodius, anno 1612, and Joninensis, anno 1614.

CHAPTER V.

On the Extent of the Atonement.

The controversy concerning the extent or universality of the atonement, was formerly agitated, and is now agitated, which imposes upon us a necessity of handling this subject, that nothing may be wanting to a clear elucidation of this all-important article of the Christian system.

Among the ancients, the Pelagians and Semipelagians contended, that Christ died for all men; hence Prosper, in his letter to Augustine, concerning the remains of the Pelagian heresy, says, "Those who embrace the Pelagian heresy, profess to believe, that Christ died for all men universally, and that none are excluded from the atonement, and redemption, which the blood of Christ has effected." And among those errors which they attribute to Augustine, they find this:—"The Saviour was not crucified for the redemption of the whole world." Faustus* says, "they wander far from the path of piety, who assert, that Christ did not die for all." Hincmar, in his letter to pope Nicholas,† recounts, among other tenets of Gotteschalcus, which he calls erroneous, that he maintained and preached, that Christ did not shed his blood precious to God the Father, for the redemption and salvation of all men, but for those only who will be saved, or for the elect. To the same purpose are the anathemas of the pretended Council of Arelate,—anathemas which are recorded in a letter to Lucidus, written by Faustus,

* Book i. De libero arbitrio. † Book iii. chap. 14.

the first leader of the Pelagian bands; in which he also asserts, that Sirmandus acknowledged himself to be a semi-pelagian. Augustine, in his age, opposed himself to these heretical innovations; so did Prosper, and Fulgentius, his disciple, and other preachers of the grace of Christ, who, travelling in their footsteps, boldly defended the truth. The truth for which these divines contended, was afterwards asserted by Remigius, bishop of Leyden.*

The same controversy was afterwards renewed among the Roman Catholics; some of whom taught, like the semi-pelagians, the doctrine of universal atonement; while others, embracing the views of Augustine and his genuine disciples, restricted the atonement to the elect. This controversy was principally between the Jesuits and Jansenists. The Jesuits, a genuine branch of the semi-pelagian sectaries, warmly contend for a universal atonement. The Jansenists, with great firmness, contended, that the atonement was restricted to the elect. In this they followed Jansenius, the founder of their order. Jansenius has examined this subject very largely, and with great solidity of argument.†

The controversy passed from the Catholics to the Protestants. The Lutherans follow the Jesuits, and contend for a universal satisfaction.‡ The Arminians, however, called remonstrants, from the remonstrance which they presented to the synod of Dort, are among the protestant churches, the great champions for a universal atonement. They have indirectly dragged into their creed, the most of the Catholic errors, from Molinus, Lessius, Suarezius, and other Jesuits. From such polluted fountains, they have among others, drunk in the error concerning universal atonement, which, they contend, was made by the death of Christ; and which is placed second among those errors that were rejected and condemned by the synod of Dort, as may be seen in the

* Liber. tribus epistolis et concilio Valentino III. anno 855. habito.

† In suo Augustino, et in apolegia Jansenii, et in catechismo de gratiæ.

‡ Eckard. Fasicul. controv. c. 15. De Predesti. q. 6. Broehmannus de gratia Dei. c. 2. 9, 17, 18, 19. et alii.

second chapter of their rejection of errors, concerning the death of Christ.

The doctrine on this subject for which the Arminians contended at the synod of Dort, which was condemned at that synod, and against which they remonstrated, is expressed in this manner:—"The price of redemption which Christ offered to his Father, was not only in itself sufficient for the redemption of the whole human family, but even by the decree, will and grace of God the Father was paid for all men and every man, so that no one is by an antecedent decree of God, particularly excluded from a participation of its fruits. 1. Christ, by the merits of his death, has so far reconciled God to the whole human family, that the Father on account of his merits, without any impeachment of his truth or justice, can enter and wishes to enter into and confirm a new covenant of grace with sinful men exposed to damnation." Hence they maintain, that, according to the counsel of God, Christ so died for all men that his death, not only on account of its own intrinsic value, is sufficient for the redemption of all men, but that agreeably to the will of God it was offered for that express purpose—that the death of Christ was a death in the room of all men, and for their good, by the intervention of which, and on account of which, God, ever after, willed to deal graciously with all men—and hence, that the death of Christ was not a blessing promised in the covenant of grace, but the very foundation of it. 2. That from his own intention and that of his Father, he has obtained for all men, as well those who perish, as for those who are saved, a restoration into a state of grace and salvation, so that no one on account of original sin, is either exposed to condemnation, or will be condemned; but all are freed from the guilt of that sin. 3. That Christ, according to the counsel of his Father, delivered himself up to the death for all men, without any fixed purpose that any individual in particular should be saved; so that the necessity and utility of the atonement made by the death of Christ, might be in every respect preserved, although the redemption obtained should not be actually applied to one indivi-

dual of the human family, for whom the redemption was obtained. 4. That Christ by his atonement merited faith and salvation for none, with such certainty, that the atonement must be applied to them for salvation; but merely acquired for God the Father a perfect willingness, and full power to treat with man upon a new footing—a power of entering into a covenant of grace, or a covenant of works with man, and of prescribing whatever conditions he chose; the performance of which conditions depends entirely on the free will of man; so that it became possible that either all, or none should fulfil them. 5. That the procurement of salvation is more extensive than its application; as salvation was obtained for all, but will be applied to very few. All these are clearly proved to be Arminian tenets, from the *Collation* published at Hague, and from the expose of their sentiments, in their remonstrance against the second article which contained a list of errors condemned by the Synod of Dort.

Though these views relative to the extent of the atonement, are not fully embraced by any of the clergy of our church, yet there are some of our ministers, who defend the doctrine of universal grace, and, in explaining their views of this subject, give great countenance to not a few of these Arminian tenets, nay, in a great measure adopt them as their own. That they may evince a philanthropy, a love of God towards the whole human family, they maintain that Christ was sent into the world by the Father as a universal remedy, to procure salvation for all men under the condition of faith. They say that though the fruit and efficacy of Christ's death will be enjoyed and experienced by a few only, on whom God, by a special decree, has determined to bestow them, yet Christ died with an intention to save all provided they would believe.* In this manner, they teach that the decree of the death of Christ preceded the

* The opinion here unfolded is, with very little variation, that of the Hopkinsians, which at present is making great progress in the northern churches.—*Translator.*

decree of election,—that in sending Christ into the world, no special respect was had to the elect any more than to the reprobate, and that Christ was equally appointed to be the Saviour of all men. They even distinctly assert that salvation was not intended to be procured for any particular persons, but the possibility of salvation was procured for all. This they tell us was effected by the removal of obstacles which justice placed in the way of man's salvation, which was done by rendering satisfaction to justice, and thus opening a door of salvation, that God, reconciled by the atonement, might, in consistency with the claims of justice, think of entering into a new covenant with man, and of bestowing upon him salvation. But as God foresaw that on account of the wickedness of their hearts, none would believe in Christ, he, by another special decree, determined to bestow upon some faith, thus enabling them to accept of salvation, and become partakers of it; while the rest of the human family would remain in unbelief, and on its account would be condemned. In this they differ from the Arminians, and embrace in so far the truth of the atonement. Such views as these which we have stated are clearly contained in their writings. Camerus* says, "the death of Christ, under the condition of faith belongs equally to all men." Testurdus speaks thus,† "The end of giving Christ for a propitiation in his blood was, that a new covenant might be entered into with the whole human family, and that without any impeachment of justice, their salvation might be rendered possible, and an offer of it made to them, in the gospel. In this sense, indeed, no one who believes the word of God, can deny that Christ died for all men." Hear also what Amyraut says,‡ "The redemption purchased by Christ may be considered in two respects. 1. Absolutely in relation to those who actually embrace it. 2. Conditionally, as offered on such terms, that if any one will accept it, he shall become a partaker of it. In the former respect it is limited,

* In Cap. 2. Epist. ad Heb. ver. 9.

† In Ireni. The. 78. et 79.

‡ Diss. de Gratia Universali.

in the latter universal. In like manner its destination is two-fold; particular, as having the decree to bestow faith connected with it; universal, when it is considered separately from this decree." This writer says expressly,* "Since the misery of the human family is equal and universal, and the desire which God has to free them from it by a Redeemer, proceeds from the mercy which he exercises towards us as his creatures fallen into destruction, in which we are all equal; the grace of redemption, that he has procured for us, and which he offers us, should be equal and universal, provided we are equally disposed to its reception," &c.

Though all agreed in this, that Christ died for all men, yet they explain themselves differently in relation to the manner in which he died for all. As appears from the quotations given above, some say openly, that Christ died conditionally for all, and absolutely for the elect only. Others, perceiving that this view of the subject leads to gross absurdities, are unwilling to express themselves in this manner, and rather choose to say that Christ did not die for men on condition that they would believe, but that his death for all was absolute whether they would believe or not. Thus that free access to salvation was opened for all who would by faith accept it, and that all obstacles being removed by the death of Christ, and every thing which prevented God from entering into a covenant with man; a way for a new covenant was opened to all men—all were placed precisely in the same salvable state. Yet they all come to this point, that Christ satisfied for all men severally and collectively, and obtained for them remission of sins and salvation; of which if many are deprived, the cause is not to be sought in any insufficiency of Christ's death, nor any failure of will and intention on his part, but in the unbelief alone, of those who wickedly and obstinately reject the salvation offered by Christ.

But the common opinion of the Reformed church, is, that Christ, from the mere good pleasure of his Father, was

* Tr. de Prædest. cap. 7.

set apart, and given as a Redeemer and head not to all men, but to a definite number, who by the decree of God constitute his mystical body. They maintain that for these alone, Christ, perfectly acquainted with the nature and extent of the work to which he was called, and knowing whom he was called to save, and to accomplish the decree of their election, and the counsel of his Father, was willing and determined to offer himself up a sacrifice in his death, and to the price of his death added an all-efficient, special intention and will, to substitute himself in their room, and acquire for them faith and salvation.

Whence we easily obtain a distinct statement of the question. 1. The question is not respecting the value and efficacy of the death of Christ; whether as to its intrinsic worth it might be sufficient for the redemption of all men. It is confessed by all, that since its value is infinite, it would have been sufficient for the redemption of the whole human family, had it appeared good to God to extend it to the whole world. To this purpose, a distinction is made by the Fathers, and retained by many divines, "*that Christ died sufficiently for all, but efficiently for the elect only.*" This is perfectly true, if it be understood of the dignity of Christ's death, though the phrase is not accurate if it be referred to the will and purpose of Christ. The question which we discuss, concerns the purpose of the Father in sending his Son, and the intention of the Son in dying. Whether the Father destined his Son for a Saviour to all men and every man, and whether the Son delivered himself up to death, with a design to substitute himself in the room of all men of all nations, to make satisfaction, and acquire salvation for them? Or, whether he resolved to give himself for the elect only, who were given him by the Father to be redeemed, and that he might be their head? The pivot on which the controversy turns is, what was the purpose of the Father in sending his Son to die, and the object which Christ had in view in dying; not what is the value and efficacy of his death. Hence the question does not, as some learned divines have affirmed, respect the revealed will of

God, but his secret will, his decree, to which the mission and death of Christ are to be referred, as all must agree.

We do not enquire respecting the fruits and efficacy of Christ's death, whether all will actually be partakers of these? which was anciently held by Puccius and Huberus. Our opponents extend these to believers only. But the question refers to the purpose of God in sending his Son into the world, and the purpose of Christ in his death.—Whether did he respect all men universally, so as to substitute himself in their room, and make satisfaction for them, and obtain for them remission of sin and salvation? Or was all this designed for the elect only? Our opponents say the former was the object; we say the latter.

We do not enquire whether the death of Christ gives occasion to the imparting of some blessings even to reprobates. Because it is in consequence of the death of Christ, that the gospel is preached to all nations, that the gross idolatry of many heathen nations has been abolished, that the daring impiety of men is greatly restrained by the word of God; that multitudes of the human family obtain many and excellent blessings, though not saving gifts of the Holy Spirit. It is unquestionable that all these flow from the death of Christ, for there would have been no place for them in the church, unless Christ had died. The question is whether the suretyship, and satisfaction of Christ were, by the will of God and purpose of Christ, destined for every individual of Adam's posterity, as our opponents teach; or for the elect only, as we maintain.

We embrace this opinion for the following reasons. 1. The mission and death of Christ are restricted to a limited number, delineated under the character of the *people* of Christ, the *sheep* of Christ, his *friends*, the *church*, his *body*, &c. but it is no where extended to all men severally and collectively. Thus Christ* "*is called Jesus*, because *he shall save his people from their sins.*" He is called† the *Saviour* of *his body*. "‡*The good shepherd who lays down*

* Matt. i. 21. † Eph. v. 23. ‡ John x. 15.

his life for the sheep," and " **for his friends*." He is said† " *to die—that he might gather together in one, the children of God that were scattered abroad*." It is said‡ that Christ " *hath purchased the church, or his flock with his own blood*." If Christ died for every one of Adam's posterity, why should the scriptures so often restrict the object of his death to a few? How could it with propriety, be said absolutely that Christ is the saviour of his people, and of his body; if he is the saviour of others also? How could it in the same way be said that he laid down his life for his sheep, for the sons of God, and for the church, if according to the will and purpose of God he died for others also? Would this be a greater proof of his love, and a firmer ground of consolation?

To this it is objected " that the scripture, which in these passages appears to limit the atonement to a few, elsewhere extends it to all." This objection is more specious than solid. The universality alluded to in this objection is not absolute, but limited; one which does not refer to all the individuals of the human family, but to individuals of all nations; as will be shewn at large hereafter. Another objection is, " that in the texts quoted above, the satisfaction is not considered separately, but in connection with its application which is limited, though the satisfaction separately considered is universal." To this we reply, that the words and phrases which the Holy Spirit uses in the texts cited above; such as " *the Saviour*," " *to lay down life for one*," " *to give himself for one*, &c." properly denote satisfaction—the procurement of salvation. And although the atonement is necessarily followed by its application, yet the proof drawn from these terms used by the Spirit, are not weakened; because the atonement, and its application are inseparably connected; and are of the same extent; all which will be proved in the proper place. Again, it is objected that " Christ died absolutely for some and conditionally for others." This however, takes for granted what ought to be proved. It is

* John xi. 52. † Acts xx. 28. ‡ Eph. viii. 25, 26.

altogether gratuitous to say, that Christ in his death had a twofold intention; one conditional, which extended to all; the other absolute, which was limited to a few. The scripture no where countenances such a distinction; it always represents the *application* of the atonement as conditional but the making of it never. The nature of the thing does not indeed, admit of such a distinction; for according to the hyphotheses of the objections, there was no consideration of the elect, in the decree, according to which Christ died; and they admit that he died with the same purpose, with which the decree was passed; for the execution must be agreeable to the plan. The plan must be filled up. Christ and the Father must have precisely the same object in view by his death. They say that the elect were separated by a posterior decree, hence as Christ was destined to die for all, before the elect were separated from the reprobate, he must have died for the elect and the reprobate in the same way. God decreed all things by one simple act, though we have to conceive of the decree by parts: who then can believe that in one simple act, God had two intentions so diverse, not to say contrary, that in one manner Christ should die for all, in another for some only? Nay, when Christ could not will to die absolutely for the elect, without involving by the law of contraries a will not to die for the reprobate, it is inconceivable how in one act he should will both to die for the reprobate, and not to die for them. Another objection offered is, that "though these scripture passages speak of the elect, yet they do not speak of them exclusively of all others, as Paul says that Christ was delivered for him, but he does not exclude others." To this I answer that though those texts upon which I rely do not explicitly exclude all others, yet they contain, in that description which they give of those for whom Christ died, certain circumstances, which clearly exclude others. Though the blessing is promised to the seed of Abraham without saying to the seed of Abraham *alone*, yet it is sufficiently clear that the blessing was confined to Abraham's seed, to the exclusion of all others. The object of the passages

quoted, is to illustrate, and magnify the love of Christ towards his sheep for whom he lays down his life—for his church and people on whose account he delivered himself up to death. But how will this exalt the love of Christ towards his people, if they have no prerogative, no claims in the death of Christ above the reprobate? Why should the immense love of Christ who lays down his life, and sheds his blood, be applied specially to the people of God? The example of Paul does not strengthen the objection; for the apostle does not speak of this as a blessing peculiar to himself, but as one common to himself and the other elect, or believers, to whom he proposes himself as an example, that they might be able to say the same thing of themselves because they were in the same state.

Another objection to the view we have given of these words of the evangelist Matthew, is quite as unsubstantial as those which we have examined. It is said that "though Christ is called the Saviour of his people in a respect peculiar to themselves,—on account of salvation's being actually bestowed upon them, yet there is no reason why he should not be the Saviour of others also on account of having obtained salvation for them, though in consequence of their unbelief they will never be made partakers of it; and that, in reference to this, Paul says that *God is the saviour of all men, especially of them that believe.*"* It is gratuitous to say, that Christ is the saviour of some, for whom he has purchased salvation, but to whom it will never be applied. It is to take for granted what ought to be proved. The very expression, *to save*, denotes the actual communication of salvation. Christ is Jesus, not only because he is willing and able to save, and because he removes all obstacles out of the way of salvation, but because he does in reality save his people, both by acquiring through his merits salvation for them, and applying it to them effectually. That such was the intention of God in sending Christ, and the end of his mission, is clearly intimated by the imposition of the

* 1 Tim. iv. 10.

name Jesus by the angel. The passage quoted from Paul's epistle to Timothy does not evince a contrary doctrine; for the word σωτηρ which is used in that passage, and translated Saviour, in its most extensive sense denotes Preserver; and when it is said that he is the Saviour of men, the meaning is that he is the preserver of all men,—he upholds all men in their being—preserves them in their present life. It is taken in a more strict and limited sense when it is applied to believers, which is denoted by the word *especially*. In what other sense than as the upholder of all men, can he be said to be the Saviour of men who finally perish? To say that Christ, by his death intended to save them, will not solve the difficulty, for we do not call a man a saviour who *intends* to save another, but him who does it actually. Now Christ does actually uphold men in this life, for "*in him we live, in him we move, and in him we have our being.*"* In this the apostle alludes to a passage in the Psalms where God is said "σωζειν *to save man and beast.*"† Whence Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Primasius, and Ambrose say "that he is the saviour of all in the present life, but of the faithful only he is the saviour as to eternal life." And Thomas, "he is the preserver of the present and future life because he saves all men with a bodily salvation, and thus he is called the saviour of all men; he also saves the righteous with both a bodily and spiritual salvation, and is hence said to be the saviour *especially* of them that believe."

As to the passage from John's gospel, let it not be objected "that those sheep, for whom Christ is said to have laid down his life, are not said to be the elect only." The context proves incontrovertibly that it can apply to none but the elect. Christ is speaking concerning sheep which hear his voice and follow him, which he has known, and loves intensely, and which he must bring into one fold, under one shepherd, v. 15, 16. Those sheep, for whom Christ lays down his life, shall be put in possession of eternal life, and no man shall be able to pluck them out of the Father's

* Acts xvii. 28. † Psal. xxxvi. 7.

hand; which things can be affirmed of none but the elect, who are called sheep, both on account of their destination to life, and their actual and effectual calling in time. Nor let it be objected, "that he is said to have laid down his life for his sheep, because they alone shall enjoy the fruits of his death, whilst others, on account of their unbelief, receive no benefit from his expiatory sacrifice. Thus, to die for some, either signifies that death is suffered simply with an intention to profit some, which is true in respect of all; or, with an intention that they shall be profited in reality, which is true in relation to sheep only." For, in answer to this objection, consider that *to lay down life for some*, can no more be referred to the enjoyment of the fruits of Christ's death, than when it is said, that he gave himself a ransom for all. There is no solid reason why the former phrase should be referred both to the intention and to the effect, but the latter restricted to the purpose and intention of bestowing help. It cannot be conceived that there is any difference between these two. He who dies for any one that he may profit him, intends that he for whom he dies shall be profited in reality; and he will in reality profit him if he has the power to do so. Now, can any one assign a reason why Christ gains the object which he had in view, as to his sheep, but misses his aim as to the rest? Equally unsubstantial is the following objection, "that Christ could not lay down his life for his sheep as such; because, then they would have been his sheep before he died for them, and purchased them for his own; hence, he died for them merely as sinners, which character belongs to them in common with others, and that hence he must have laid down his life in this way for others." To this I reply, that though they were not actually his sheep, yet they were so by destination. They had been given to Christ to be purchased and redeemed by him as the good shepherd, who must shed his blood for their redemption. By the decree of God they were given to him, before they were actually in his hands.*

* John xvii. 24.

Nay, the mission of Christ is founded in that donation. "And this is the Father's will who hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose none, but should raise it up again at the last day."* Had there not been a fixed number contemplated by God when he appointed Christ to die, then the effects of Christ's death would have been uncertain, and the mystery of our redemption might have been rendered utterly vain and fruitless, by the perverseness of man, in refusing to accept it.

Though in Eph. v. 25. and Tit. ii. 14. it is not *expressly* said that Christ gave himself for *none others* but his church and people, yet, from the expressions used in these passages, and from the nature of the thing, it is clearly deducible that his offering of himself was so restricted. Because, the giving of himself, which the apostle describes, arises from the love of Christ towards his church as his spouse, and such a love necessarily excludes a similar love to others. In the preceding verse the apostle gives this commandment, "*husbands love your wives.*" Now, though the apostle does not add "let your love of women be confined to your wives," yet all will acknowledge that such a restriction is necessarily implied in the apostle's command. Who would hear, without indignation, the adulterer plead thus in vindication of his crime,—"It is indeed said, *husbands love your wives*, but it is not said, love those alone!" The giving of himself which is here attributed to Christ, is one which has for its object the sanctification of his church, and its salvation: both the procurement and application of salvation, which belong to the elect, and to the elect only. Since he delivered himself up for none except for this purpose, how can he be said to have delivered himself for those who will not attain to that end?

In vain is it objected to the passages quoted, from Matthew's gospel, and from the epistle to the Hebrews,† "that many is not opposed to all, but to one or a few, as is done Rom. v, 19. and Daniel xii. 1. and that many is often put for

* John vi. 39. † Matt. xx. 28. and xxvi. 28. Heb. ix. 28.

all." The many of which the apostle and the evangelist treat, are described by such characters as cannot be applied to all men of all nations. For, of the many here spoken of, it is said, "*that he gave himself a ransom*," or actually substituted himself in their room,—that *he shed his blood for the remission of their sins*, and "*that he offered himself to bear the sins of many*," i. e. that their sins might be through his atoning sacrifice really taken away. Though many is sometimes opposed to one or a few, yet it is not necessary on that account, to understand it so in these passages, for it is often used when all cannot be included. Hiero, in his comment on Matthew xx. says, "The evangelist does not say that Christ gave himself for *all*, but for *many*, i. e. for all those who would believe, (who are none other than the elect in whom God works, both to will and to do,*) for many, not for all; but for those only who were predestinated to life."

2. We farther agree in favour of restricting the atonement to a limited and definite number, from the destination of Christ to the mediatorial office. He was destined to die for those only who were given him by the Father. All men universally were not given to Christ, but a limited number only. When, in the council of the Father, which regulated Christ's death, and defined its object, not only Christ was set apart as Mediator, but also those for whose redemption and salvation he was to suffer; it is plain that he could die for those only who were, in this sense given him. Here we may remark a twofold donation. One of Christ to men, another of men to Christ. Christ was given to men for the purpose of saving them, and men to Christ, that through him they might be saved. The former is referred to in Isa. ix. 6., and xlix. 6. as well as in all those places, in which he is said to be given and sent to us; the latter is alluded to in the places where mention is made of those given to Christ; as in John xvii. 2. 6. 12. and vi. 37. Seeing this twofold

* These words in the parenthesis are interlined as a glossary on this passage of Hiero's book.

giving is reciprocal, each of them must be of the same extent, so that Christ is given for none others, but those who are given to him, and all those are given to Christ for whom he is given. Now, it is abundantly plain, that some men only, and not all men were given to Christ. This is asserted in many texts of scripture, where those who are given to him are distinguished from other men.* "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he might give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.—I have manifested thy name unto the men whom thou hast given me out of the world; thine they were, and thou gavest them me." Christ designates those whom the Father gave him by such phrases as these, the people whom he foreknew,† heirs and children of promise,‡ the seed of Abraham, not carnal but spiritual, both of the Jews and Gentiles,§ his people and body, the church,‖ vessels of mercy, prepared to glory,¶ elect, chosen in Christ, and predestinated to the adoption of sons, and to conformity to his image,** and the posterity of the second Adam, all of whom are to be quickened in Christ, in opposition to the posterity of the first Adam, in whom all die.†† From all which it appears, that Christ was not given for all of all nations, but for a limited number only.

To no purpose will our opponents reply, that "the giving of Christ was conditional, not absolute—that the condition was that all who would by faith receive the offered salvation, should be made partakers of it, which was not to be the case with all, and hence, it is not surprising that they derive no advantage from it." This is a begging of the question; it is without foundation in scripture, which no where mentions such a conditional giving of Christ. Though faith is proposed as a means and condition necessary to the reception of Christ, and the enjoyment of the blessings of-

* John xvii. 2, 6.
‡ Rom. ix.
‖ Matt. i. 25.
** Rom. ix. 24.
† Rom. xi. 2.
§ Rom. i. 4. 13.
¶ Rom. ix. 24.
†† 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23.

fered in the gospel, yet, it does not follow, that it was a condition to the giving of Christ, since faith itself is a gift of grace, and one of the fruits of Christ's being delivered up for sinners. Further, if the giving of Christ rested upon any condition, the condition must either depend on God or upon man. The latter of these can be affirmed by none but a Pelagian;* if the former be affirmed, then the opinion embraced by our opponents will be, that Christ is said to be given to us as a Saviour by God on these terms, that he will bestow him on us, on condition of his working faith in us, which faith however, he will not give, though he alone is able to give it. How glaring an absurdity!

The doctrine for which we here contend, is farther confirmed from the connection of that twofold relation to us, which Christ sustains,—the relation of a surety, and the relation of a head. He is our surety, that he may acquire salvation for us, by rendering to justice that satisfaction which it demands. He is our head, in order to apply this salvation to us, by working in us faith and repentance, through the effectual operations of his Holy Spirit upon our hearts. Hence, as he is not given as a head to all men, but to his members only, or, which is the same thing, to the elect, who are actually to partake of salvation, he cannot be the surety or sponsor of any other than these. Of whomsoever he is the surety, he is also the head. The one cannot be extended farther than the other. The same doctrine is proved from the connection between the death and resurrection of Christ, in which also there is a twofold relation. Since he died as surety, he must rise as head, as the reason for his death and resurrection are the same; nor can any reason be given, why the ground of the one should be more extensive than that of the other. Hence it is, that the apostle Paul speaks of these as being equal in efficacy and extent: "Christ died for our sins, and rose again for our justification."† "That he died for all, that they which live, should not live unto themselves, but unto him who died for

* It is not now affirmed by the Hopkinsians. † Rom. iv. 25.

them, and rose again."* Hence it cannot be said, that he died for any others than those for whom he rose, because no one will be a partaker of the fruits of Christ's death, unless by his resurrection. But that he did not rise as a head to confer salvation upon all, is a truth incontrovertible.

The same doctrine is established by the connection between the atonement, and the intercession of Christ. As they are both parts of his priestly office, they must be of the same extent, so that for all for whom he made satisfaction, he should also intercede, and not make atonement for those who will never have a place in his intercession. The object of his propitiation and of his appearance in the presence of God ought to be one. The apostles Paul and John represent their connection as indissoluble.† That he does not intercede for all but only for those who are given him by the Father, Christ himself expressly declares;‡ "*I pray not for the world but for those whom thou hast given me out of the world.*" When it is so much more easy to pray for any one than to lay down life for them, will any one say that Christ would die for those for whom he would not pray? Will they say that at the very moment before his death he would refuse his prayers on behalf of those for whom he is just about to shed his blood? Those who assert that Christ died for all men of all nations must say so, or otherwise that in consequence of the atonement all men shall be made partakers of life, and a blessed immortality; for the Father always hears Christ. If he prays for all, all will be saved.

The objection which the Remonstrants, or Arminians offer, is frivolous, "that there is a twofold intercession of Christ, one universal, which is made for the whole world, of which intercession Isaiah speaks in the fifty-third chapter, and twelfth verse of his prophecy, and agreeably to which he is said to have prayed for his murderers;§ another particular which is made for believers only, which is spoken of, John ix. and Rom. viii." I answer that the objection rests not on any foundation, either in scripture or reason. As was hinted

* 2 Cor. iv. 15. † 1 John ii. 1, 2. Rom. viii. 34. ‡ John xvii. 9.
§ Luke xxiii. 24.

above, Christ is always heard and answered by the Father,* hence if Christ prays for all, all will be saved. The doctrine of universal intercession is not taught by the prophet Isaiah, where he says, "*he made intercession for the transgressors*,"† it is not said that he made intercession for all, but for some whose characters are delineated by the prophet in a preceding verse where he says that they are persons who shall be justified by Christ. It is not said Luke xxiii. 4, that he prayed for all those who crucified him, but for some of them only, and we are assured that some of his crucifiers obtained pardon, no doubt the fruit of the prayer which Christ offered up on the cross to the Father.‡ Nor, if Christ through the impulse of humane affections of love, prayed for those who perished, is it to be considered that the intercessory prayers, which he offered as Mediator, and from his special office are to be extended to others, than the elect given him by the Father. To the elect Christ himself restricts his intercessory prayers.

This argument will not be weakened by objecting that it is the world of unbelievers only, who are excluded from the prayers of Christ, those who are guilty of rejecting the gospel, and hate believers, v. 14, but not the world chosen by God, for the redemption of which he has sent his Son.§ The object of Christ's intercessory prayers is to obtain for believers perseverance in grace. The world, for which Christ says he does not pray, is opposed to those given him by his Father in the decree of election; the world then of which he speaks must embrace all the reprobate who were not given to Christ, and this antecedently to their rejection of the offered salvation. They were passed by as sinners, whether their sins were want of faith in the gospel, or merely violations of the law of nature. As the act of God by which he chose to pass by a certain number of men, and not appoint them to salvation, was done from eternity, there never existed a period, when they, the world for whom Christ does not pray, were viewed in any other light, than as excluded

* John xi. 42. † Isa. xxiii. 12. ‡ Acts ii. 3. § John iii. 16.

from the benefits of his mediation and intercession. It forms no objection to this that God is said, "to have so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish," because, as will be made appear in the proper place, this does not extend to all men of all nations, but to the elect of every nation. Though he prays for the apostles who were then believers, and asks for them perseverence, yet it does not follow that he prays for them as believers only, and in consequence of their faith: for Christ, v. 20, prays for all who should afterwards believe, "That they should be sanctified through the truth and made perfect in one." Now, as this sanctification, and attainment to perfection, could not be effected without the instrumentality of faith, Christ must have prayed for faith to be given them. Hence even that faith by which the gospel is embraced, is given to believers in consequence of Christ's intercessory prayers. Farther, as Christ declares that he sanctifies himself for those who are the objects of that intercessory prayer, that they may be sanctified through the truth; and as these belong to none but the elect, the conclusion is irresistible, that Christ's intercessory prayers are extended to the elect only—to those who shall be saved, with an everlasting salvation.

The inseparable connection between the gift of Christ, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, bears testimony the most conclusive, to the definite atonement. As these two gifts, the most excellent, which God has bestowed on us, are always in scripture, joined together as cause and effect,* so they must be of equal extent—they must go together; so that the Son might not be given to acquire salvation for any others, than those to whom the Spirit was given for the application of the salvation procured. No reason can be assigned, why the gift of the Son should be more extensive than the gift of the Holy Spirit. It is plain that the Holy Spirit is given to none but the elect. Hence, if there be any harmony between the works of the Son,

* John xvi. 7. Gal. iv. 4, 6. Rom. viii. 9. 1 John iii. 24.

and of the Holy Spirit, in the economy of salvation, Christ was given to die for the elect, and for them only. Pertinent to this purpose is the argument of the apostle Paul, in which, from the giving of Christ, he infers the communication of every blessing. "He that spared not his own Son, but freely delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?"* The apostle reasons from the greater to the less. Surely he, who gave his Son, which, incontrovertibly was the greater gift, will not refuse to give us faith and all other saving blessings which are the less; and this the rather, because, as we shall presently prove, Christ by delivering himself up, has merited for us, together with salvation, all those gifts. Whence the conclusion is inevitable; either all those blessings shall be given to the reprobate, if Christ died *for them*; or if they are not given them, which is granted by all, then Christ did not die for them, i. e. he did not die for all. This is not answered by alleging that the apostle speaks of Christ's being given in a special manner to the believers. For, as was said above, the supposition, of a universal giving is gratuitous, and nowhere countenanced in scripture; and since faith is a fruit of Christ's death, it cannot be a condition antecedent to his death. Farther, when according to the order which is laid down by our learned opponents themselves, the decree concerning Christ's death was antecedent to the decree relative to bestowing faith; it is inconceivable how at one and the same time, and in the self same simple act, Christ could be delivered up for all, and for some only.

3. Another topic of argumentation, from which I confirm the same doctrine, is the superlative love of Christ towards those for whom he died. He loved them with the most ardent affection.† Greater love has no one, than that one should lay down his life for his friend. In the same exalted strain does the apostle Paul extol the love

* Rom. viii. 32. † John xv. 13.

of Christ:—he speaks of it as admirably intense, and unheard of among men.* "Scarcely for a righteous man will one die, yet, peradventure for a good man some would dare even to die. But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." But this cannot be said of all men, and every man; for, I presume that all are agreed, that Christ loved Peter more than Judas. It is inconceivable, how Christ could love with ineffable ardour of affection, those whom as an inexorable judge he had already consigned to mansions of endless woe, and despair, and those whom by an irrevocable decree he had resolved to consign to the same endless misery. It cannot with any colour of propriety be said that Christ and his apostle, are treating of external acts of love. For, besides, that external acts of love, presuppose those which are internal; if Christ exercises external acts of love so great that none can be greater, it follows that he has done, and that he does so much for those who perish, that it is impossible for him to do more for the elect who shall be saved; than which nothing can be more absurd. Nor, if he loves some of the elect more than others, with a love of complaisance on account of the internal gifts of his Spirit, a diversity of which is necessary to the perfection of his mystical body, does it result as a consequence from this, that the disposition of his soul towards each of them as to the promotion of their good, is supremely tender and affectionate.

4. I infer the truth of the same doctrine from the nature of Christ's suretyship. For it imports not merely the substitution of Christ in our room, so that he died not only for our good, but in our place, as is said above, and proved against the disciples of Socinus. Hence, from the nature of his suretyship, he must transfer upon himself, and take away from them all the debt of those whose persons he sustains; and liquidate the whole debt as perfectly as if they themselves had done it in their own persons. Can it be conceived

* Rom. v. 7, 8.

that those for whom he died and in this manner, may yet be subjected to eternal vengeance, and bound to suffer again deserved punishment? This question must be answered in the affirmative by all those who assert that Christ died for many who shall not be saved by his death: and yet to say so is to impeach the justice and veracity of God. For if in consequence of his suretyship, the debt has been transferred to Christ, and by him discharged, every one must see that it has been taken away from the primary debtors, so that payment cannot be demanded from them. They must forever afterwards remain free, absolved from all obligation to punishment. Pertinent to this purpose are all those passages of scripture which assert that our sins were laid upon Christ, that the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and that by his stripes we are healed,* and those which declare that he was made a curse for us that we might be made the righteousness and blessing of God in him.†

Christ died for those only for whom he procured and to whom he applies salvation. As he procured and applies salvation to the elect only, hence for them only he died. That Christ did not die for any but those for whom he procured salvation, and to whom he will apply it, appears,—1st, From the object of Christ's death. His death was destined by God to procure salvation for us. 2. The procurement cannot be separated from the application; what other end can there be in procuring a thing, but that it may be applied? A thing is procured in vain, which is never applied. Hence it follows, that if salvation is procured for, it will and must be applied to us. If it be not applied to all, but to the elect only, then it was not procured for all, but for the elect only. In vain it is objected, "that Christ's death was not intended so much to procure salvation, as to remove all the obstacles which justice threw in the way of our salvation, and which prevented God from thinking of our salvation." From this view of the subject, Christ rather procured for us the possibility of being saved than salvation itself—and placed it

* Isa. liii. 5, 6. † 2 Cor. v. 25. Gal. iii. 13.

in the power of the Father to enter into a new covenant with man—all which Arminian tenets were condemned by the synod of Dort, as injurious opinions, offering indignity to the efficacy of the cross of Christ. The opinions and decisions of the great and good men who composed the synod merit high respect, though they are not infallible. In this case the decision is supported both by scripture and reason. How can Christ be said to have given himself a ransom—a price of redemption for us—to have procured for us eternal salvation—to redeem us from all iniquity, and other things of the same kind, which denote not the possibility, but actual procurement of salvation; if after all, he only rendered it possible that we might be saved?

Another objection equally futile is that "redemption was procured for all with a design that it should be applied to them; provided they would not reject it." This cannot be asserted with respect to an innumerable number, to whom Christ has never been offered, and who do not know him even in name. If it be alleged that Christ proposed to himself an object so vain and fruitless respecting a thing which should never happen, and which could not happen without his gift, which he determined not to give, what an indignity is offered to his wisdom! It represents Christ as saying, I wish to obtain salvation for all, to the end that it may be applied to them, will they but believe; however, I am resolved not to reveal this redemption to all, and to refuse to innumerable multitudes that salvation which is essentially necessary to their embracing of it—the only means by which it can be applied to them. Shall men, to support a favorite theory, make the infinitely wise and holy Jesus say, I desire that to come to pass, which I know neither will nor can take place; and I am even unwilling that it should, for I refuse to communicate the only means by which it can ever be brought to pass, and the granting of this means depends upon myself, and upon myself alone. What a shameful indignity does this offer to the wisdom of Emanuel! It would be an insult to the understanding of frail man. Nor will the matter be amended by saying that the failure of the applica-

tion is not to be attributed to Christ, but to the wickedness and unbelief of man. This is not less injurious to the honour of Christ, for it represents him either as not foreseeing, or as not capable of preventing those impediments, which might obstruct the application of the salvation, which he obtained, and thus cause him to miss his aim. They indeed allege that it was not in vain, though it fails of success; because, however men treat the salvation offered them, Christ will not miss the prime object which he had in view in his death; that is, that pardon and salvation may be provided for men, if they will believe and repent—and that before his death the rigour of divine, inexorable justice, rendered this salvation impossible, and that nothing now hinders but the sinner's obstinacy. All this does not remove the absurdity. The object in procuring salvation could be none other than its application; and it was obtained for no valuable purpose if it is never applied; and thus loses its object. Christ needs not die for men, to procure for them pardon and saltion under a condition, which it is impossible for them to comply with; but he died that he might in reality obtain pardon and complete redemption, for his people.

This is confirmed from the manner in which Christ procured salvation; for if the procurement extended to all, it must be either absolute or conditional. The former will not be asserted, for then all men, universally, would be saved. The latter is equally inadmissible, for—1st. What is procured conditionally, is not, properly speaking, procured at all, but only a mere possibility of its being procured, provided the condition is complied with. 2d. Either Christ has procured the condition itself for all, or for some only. If he has acquired the condition for all, then all will assuredly be saved; for this condition could be obtained for them in no other way than absolutely; unless indeed they would say that there is a condition of a condition, which, though it is absurd, as tending to stretch out into an endless chain of conditions, yet all these conditional conditions will be, on the present supposition purchased by Christ. If the condition, by which the salvation is to be obtained, has been procured for some only, then the salvation has not been fully

procured for all. The procurement has been partial and defective in the most essential point. In this view, vain and delusive has been the act by which salvation is said to have been provided; for the condition annexed to it is one, with which the sinner is utterly unable to comply—it is a condition, which will never be performed, and which God not only foresaw would never be complied with, but he also decreed not to give the power to fulfil it, while he alone is able to give it. Finally, this subterfuge represents Christ as having had a double intention in his atonement; one conditional, in favour of all, the other absolute, in favour of the elect—a representation unsupported by reason and revelation, and irreconcilable with the unity and simplicity of the decree, which appointed the death of Christ.

5. Another source from which we argue in favour of limiting the atonement, is the extent and fulness of the blessings which Christ purchased for all those for whom he died. Christ suffered death for those only, for whom he merited salvation, and with salvation all the means necessary to put them in possession of it, especially faith and repentance; and opened a way for the application by the Holy Spirit, the author of both; without all which, salvation is unattainable. That he purchased faith, repentance, and the graces of the Holy Spirit, for all men universally, cannot be said; for then all men would necessarily be saved by his death. He procured them for the elect only; therefore for the elect only he died. This argument is irresistibly conclusive, unless it is denied that Christ purchased those means of salvation. But that Christ purchased faith for man, is proved, by the most luminous scriptural testimony. 1. Christ is said to be* "ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτὴς πίστεως, the author and finisher of our faith." If he is the author of our faith, he must be its purchaser, for he bestows nothing on us, which he has not procured for us by his merits. 2. Christ is the meritorious cause of salvation. To him and his merits we are entirely indebted for our salvation, and consequently for every part

* Heb. xii. 5. Acts, v. 31.

of it, for every thing which contributes to our salvation. But faith and spiritual life which he works and implants in us, are the chief part of our salvation. 3. Christ is the cause and foundation of all spiritual blessings;* "Who," Christ, "hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings." And faith is one of the greatest spiritual blessings which God bestows on man. Hence it is elsewhere said,† "It is given you on the part of Christ not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake." In what other sense can faith be said to be given us for Christ's sake, but because he purchased it for us? 4. Christ promised to send the Spirit; he must have opened a way by his death for the Spirit's operations, and established such a connection between his purchase and the communication of the graces of the Spirit, that the Spirit necessarily, though freely, works all these graces in the hearts of those for whom Christ shed his blood. Hence the Spirit is spoken of as one of the fruits of *Christ's death.*‡ All the gifts of the Spirit, especially faith, are the fruits of Christ's purchase. Here we are not to distinguish between the Spirit as sanctifying and comforting, and the Spirit as imparting spiritual illumination to the mind; as if Christ had merited the former only, and not the latter. For as all the graces of the heart proceed from the same Spirit, he who opened by his purchase a way for the operations of the Spirit, the author of these graces; must also have purchased for us all his gifts; and as faith is the principle and root of our sanctification, he who purchased the graces of the Spirit who sanctifies, must also have purchased "faith, which worketh by love, and purifieth the heart." 5. Christ could not be a full and perfect Saviour, unless he had procured for us faith, without which it is impossible to be made partakers of salvation. This doctrine has been uniformly taught in the Reformed church. They maintained that Christ had not less procured for us faith, than salvation—and that he is the cause of all the gifts which the Father bestows upon us. Hence the venerable divines of the synod of Dort in their

* Eph. i. 3. † Phil. i. 29. ‡ John xvi. 7.

exhibition of the doctrines of truth, say,* "Christ, by his death, purchased for us faith and all the other saving graces of the Spirit." And to the same purpose, in their condemnation of errors,† they pronounce those "unsound in the faith," who teach that Christ, by his satisfaction, did not merit salvation for any definite number, and also that faith, by which his satisfaction is efficaciously applied for salvation,—and that he purchased no more than a power, and entire willingness for the Father to enter into a new covenant with man, and to prescribe whatever conditions he might think fit; the compliance with which conditions depended upon the free will of man; so that either all, or none might fulfil them. Such teachers think too meanly of the death of Christ, are ignorant of its glorious fruits, and the blessings procured by it, and drag from its grave the Pelagian heresy."

It is a vain distinction which some make here, respecting the decree. They say "that we must distinguish between the decree to deliver Christ up to death," and his death, which took place in time; that the decree to deliver Christ up to die for sinners, was antecedent to the election of a definite number, but his death procured the decree of special election." Amyraut,‡ speaking of Christ's death in time, says, "*redemption ought to be equal, that it may respect all, as the creatures of God equally sinful,*" &c. He elsewhere says, "that the nature of the thing proves this, for seeing the affection of the Son must be the same with that of the Father, for all men as his children; so the death of Christ in time, must be conformed to the eternal decree of the Father, as he would not make an atonement, unless according to the decree, and command of his Father. Therefore, when the decree of the Father respecting Christ's death, proceeded from equal fatherly affection towards all, before any were elected to faith; Christ, in his death, could have no other end and intention than to execute his counsel." Even in this view of the subject, Christ in his death, must have consider-

* Th. 8. † Th. 3. ‡ De Prædesti. p. 77.

ed some as elect, and others as reprobate; for when there could be no election without reprobation, it was impossible for Christ to think of some as elected, without at the same time, viewing others as passed by, or reprobated. If, then, he willed to die for those whom he knew to have been elected, and that with a special affection for them as elected ones; he must, according to Amyraut, have been willing to die with the same affection for those whom he knew to be reprobates, and that as reprobates; for, says Amyraut, "he died to fulfil the decree of the Father, which proceeded from an equal love to all." Hence, this monstrous absurdity will follow, that Christ, out of the most ardent affection for those who he knew would never be saved, died with an intention and desire to save them; while both he and his Father had decreed, that they should not be saved! It will not avail to free our opponents from this absurdity, to say, that he did not die for the reprobate formally as reprobate, but that he died for those as men, who at another time had been passed by, and thus excluded from salvation. Besides, that it is inconceivable how such abstractions can belong to a unique, and simple decree; it would follow that Christ did not die for the elect as such. Here we reason by the rule of contraries. If Christ did not die for the reprobate as reprobate, we infer the same with respect to the elect. It appears inexplicable, how Christ in his death, could have respect to a first and fourth decree, respecting the elect—that he should die for them formally as elect, and materially as men; for so Amyraut speaks. It is inconceivable how much abstraction he uses, and represents God, in relation to the reprobate, viewing them as men and not as reprobate, especially when election and reprobation go hand in hand, and mutually imply each other.

But certain learned men being aware, that their hypothesis, which makes faith no fruit of Christ's death, but a gift of the Father, leads to great absurdities, offers indignity to Christ, and is injurious to salvation, have invented some other curious, intricate distinctions to free themselves from the difficulties which meet them. Some-

times they teach, "that Christ did procure faith and repentance for all, conditionally however." Again they say, "that he did not procure them in the way of satisfaction, or meritoriously; but in the way of final cause, that faith might be given to the elect to bring them to Christ." But neither of these can be affirmed with truth. The former supposition is inadmissible; for how could faith be procured for us conditionally, when it is itself a condition. Although faith is usually represented as a condition, required to interest us in Christ, and put us in possession of the salvation which he hath procured; yet it is also held forth as one of the blessings of the new covenant,—a blessing which Christ has purchased for us. Whence Christ is not only to be viewed as having procured for us salvation, if we believe, but also faith, that we may believe. The latter supposition is equally without any foundation in truth. In the schools of theology, no one ever before heard of a procurement, in the way of final cause, and not in the way of meritorious cause, or of satisfaction. The procuring of salvation, and all things connected with it, is founded in the atonement, and merits of the person who procures it. Then, if Christ did not procure for us faith in the way of meritorious cause, he did not merit faith. It cannot be said, that Christ, in the way of final cause, procured faith for a limited number; for, on the hypotheses of those who make this distinction, there were none elected when God decreed that procurement, which Christ was to effect by his death. Again, faith must either have been procured in the way of final cause, for all those, for whom salvation has been procured, or it is not. If the former be said, then as they maintain that salvation has been procured for all, all will be saved. If the latter be said, then to what purpose has salvation been procured, by the atonement for those, who have not had procured for them in the way of final cause, that, without which, they can never be made partakers of the salvation which is said to have been provided for them? Again, faith has either been procured for all in the way of final cause, or for the elect only. If for all, then all shall be saved, which our opponents do not maintain. If it was obtained for the elect only, then Christ, in and

by his death, must have done more for the elect, than for those who were not elected; while yet our opponents declare that, in the passing of the decree, that Christ should die, and which decree appointed and defined the objects of his death, God respected all men equally. Thus, in whatever light we examine this hypothesis, contradictions and absurdities grow out of it. As faith has been equally procured for all, but all will not be made partakers of it; or if it has not been procured for all, how vain and delusive is the procurement of that salvation, which is only procured on the condition of faith, which he, who procured the salvation, knew it was morally impossible for the sinner to exercise, without special grace, and yet God, who alone can give it, has refused to give it. Hence then, we arrive at this conclusion: either faith is completely in the power of the natural man, as Pelagius held; or it must have been procured by Christ in the atonement, and in consequence thereof given us by the Father.

To free themselves from all these difficulties, our adversaries sometimes attempt to illustrate their view of the subject, by a comparison instituted between Christ, and a prince who pays the price of redemption for all his subjects, who are taken captive by the enemy; though he does not effect by it the liberation of all; because some of them are unwilling to be set free. This comparison fails in one all-important circumstance. The prince is not able to give to those captives, who choose to remain in bondage, *the will*, to avail themselves of the price of redemption, which has been paid. Christ gives the will. Were there a prince, who could not only pay the ransom for his captive subjects, but could also give them the will to avail themselves of it; nay, farther, suppose that the prince knew that they had not, and that they could not have this will unless he bestowed it upon them, which he yet would not do; could any one say, that he seriously wished them to be liberated, and had paid the ransom with a serious intention to emancipate them? Again, if this comparison be urged, its force may be easily retorted. As the corporeal liberation of a captive cannot be effected by the mere payment of a ransom; the chains and fetters which bind him in the

prison must be broken asunder, otherwise the payment of the ransom will be ineffectual. In the same manner, in order to emancipate the soul, from the spiritual bondage of sin, it is not enough that a ransom is paid to justice, the chains of sin and unbelief, which bind the prisoner, so that he is both unable and unwilling to enjoy his liberty, must be burst asunder by the hand of the Almighty.

Again I reason thus in behalf of limited atonement; if Christ died for all, then he made expiation for all their sins. Christ then, must have made atonement for the sins of unbelief and final impenitence, which prevent man from applying to himself that redemption, which has been provided for him; and thus they will no longer stand in the way of such an application; for on the supposition of satisfaction having been made for them, they must be pardoned. To this it cannot rationally be objected, that the blessings will be applied, if the condition on which redemption has been procured be complied with. It implies a contradiction to talk of the condition's being complied with, when the unbelief and impenitence are supposed to be final. It is as absurd to pretend that Christ died to atone for man's unbelief, provided he would not be unbelieving, but believe; as to say I have found out an infallible remedy for the healing of a blind or leprous man which shall be applied on this condition, that he will not be blind, nor leprous. Farther, a failure in fulfilling the condition cannot prevent the application of redemption to unbelievers; for it is supposed that Christ by his death has made atonement for unbelief, and thus has atoned for the want of complying with the condition. But, since every one must see that this cannot be affirmed of those who will not be saved, or of the reprobate; the conclusion is irresistible, that Christ did not die for them.

6. The last topic of argumentation, to which I resort on this subject, is, the absurdities, that flow from the doctrine of universal atonement. If Christ died for all men universally, it will follow:—1. That he died, on condition they would believe, for multitudes innumerable, to whom his

death has never been made known; and hence it was impossible that they could believe. 2. That he died for those whom he knew to be children of perdition, whom God had passed by, resolving never to save them, and who would not, to all eternity, enjoy any of the fruits of his death; and so exercised ineffable love towards those, whom both he and the Father will eternally cause to suffer under the effects of their wrath and avenging justice. 3. That he died for those, who previously to his death, were actually condemned without all hope of reprieve, and were in hell suffering his avenging wrath, and that as their surety he suffered punishment in the place of those who were suffering punishment for themselves, and must suffer it without end. 4. That Christ is the Saviour and Redeemer of those who never will be saved or redeemed, and who by an eternal decree of the Father were passed by, and no redemption appointed for them. Or otherwise he must be an imperfect Saviour, having obtained a salvation which he never applies; for he indeed cannot be properly called a Saviour of any but those whom he makes to be partakers of salvation, and who will actually be saved.

I shall now proceed to answer objections. Christ is no where in scripture said to have died for all, unless some limitation is added; from which it may be inferred, that these scriptures, in which he is said to have died for all, do not teach that he suffered for all men of all nations, but that the object of his death is restricted, to a limited number only. Sometimes it is limited to the multitude of the elect, which has an universality peculiar to itself. When it is said 2 Cor. v. 15, "*that Christ died for all*," it is not to be understood of all those "*who are dead*," in sin; for the object of the apostle, in this chapter, is not to demonstrate the general depravity of men, but to shew how great the obligations are which bind believers to the performance of duty, both on account of their justification through the imputation of the merits of Christ's death, which delivers them from all obligations to suffer for their sins, a fully as if they had made satisfaction in their own

persons; and an account of their sanctification through the crucifixion of the old man with his affections and lusts, by the efficacy of the cross of Christ. Those are understood, who no more live unto themselves, but unto Christ; those for whom Christ *not only died*, but also *rose again;* and those *whom the love of Christ constraineth.* All these characters limit the *all* of the apostle. As if the apostle had said Christ died for all who are described by these characteristics. They agree to none but the elect, who will be actually saved; to whom alone it belongs to die in Christ, as to the old covenant, and to die with him, as the apostle elsewhere declares.* When the apostle in the 19th verse of this chapter, says, "that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses to them," he must be understood as treating of the world of those actually reconciled, "to whom he does not impute their sins." It is plain that this agrees to none but to the elect. To all others he does impute the sins, which they commit. The psalmist says,† they are blessed to whom the Lord does not impute sin. Surely this cannot be affirmed of those who will never be saved. In the sense in which the psalmist speaks, and in which the apostle speaks in Rom. vi. we are to understand the words of the apostle Rom. v. 18, 19. "By the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men to justification of life; for as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." The *all men* who receive "justification of life," are those, "who receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness;" and they can be none other than those who are actually justified. Who are they that actually obtain justification? They are believers, and believers alone; the elect, and the elect alone, who pertain to the community of the body of Christ, which is composed of all its members, and are the *all* of which the apostle speaks. As Adam is opposed to Christ, Head to Head; as sin and death have passed upon all

* Rom. vi. 6. 8. † Psal. xxxi. 1.

who descend from Adam; in like manner, all who pertain to Christ the second Adam obtain justification and life. The apostle elsewhere expresses this by the phrases dying, and *being made alive.** "As in Adam all die;" that is all who die, die in Adam, and on account of his sin; "so in Christ shall all be made alive;" that is all who will be "made alive," in grace and glory will be made alive in Christ, and on his account. All those for whom Christ is said† to have "*tasted death*," are sons, who are either brought, or to be brought to glory, the captain of whose salvation is Christ; whom Christ calls brethren, and whom God has given him. Will any one say that all these things can be affirmed of the reprobate? When the objector is prepared to say so, then, and not till then, let him quote this text, in proof of universal atonement.

Sometimes, the sacred writers use the word *all*, to exclude all distinctions of nations, age, sex, conditions, qualities, and other varieties, by which men are distinguished from one another; and not with a view to comprehend every individual. To this purpose speaks the apostle of the Gentiles.† "For the scripture saith whosoever believeth on him, shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him." To the same effect he speaks elsewhere.‡ In him therei s neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all." As if the apostle should say, no difference of nations, or conditions, either promotes or hinders salvation; but Christ bestows all things necessary for salvation, which he applies in all who believe, without any regard to nation or condition. This is explained by John in the Apocalypse,§ "and they sung a new song, saying thou art worthy to take the book, and open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and peo-

* 1 Cor. xv. 22. † Heb. ii. 9. Rom. x. 11.
‡ Col. iii. 11. § Rev. v. 9.

ple, and nations." In their song, they sing, saying, from all the tribes of Israel, and from men of all nations, whether they are the more civilized people, or more barbarous nations, hast those redeemed us.

The passage so often in the mouths of our opponents,* "Who gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time;" teaches the doctrine which is illustrated in the foregoing section, and none other. The all here spoken of, are those in whose place Christ substituted himself to bear the punishment due to them for their sins, and to pay for them a price of redemption. This is the import of the word ἀντίλυτρον, as all the orthodox have maintained against Socinus, and his disciples. This he cannot be said to have done for all; for so none could be condemned to suffer for his own sins. Paul speaks of all those, for whom Christ is Mediator, by intercession, as well as by satisfaction, for we have shown above that these two functions of his priestly office are inseparable. The Arminians themselves admit that Christ does not intercede for all men. The objects of the apostle's discourse, are such as God "wills to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth." Experience teaches us that he does not so will with respect to all men universally. This we have proved at large under a former head where the subject of God's desire to save all men is minutely examined. We there remarked that if God desires to save men who are not saved, his power must be limited, and who will dare say so? Besides, can we conceive that a being desires to accomplish an object and is unable to effect it, without also conceiving that being to be in some measure unhappy? At least we must suppose he would have been more happy had he gained his object; and who will dare to attribute imperfection of happiness to God? Doubtless he who asserts that God earnestly desires the salvation of those whom he cannot save, must assert, that Deity is deficient both in power and happiness. Farther if there are men whom God desires to save and cannot, his not being

*1 Tim. ii. 6.

able to effect their salvation must proceed from one of two causes—either the impossibility of making an atonement for their sins; or the obstinacy of their depravity is so great that he cannot vanquish it. The former of these cannot be said by our adversaries, for they assert that Christ made atonement for the sins of all men without any exception. The latter ground is untenable. From the great transgressors who have been made illustrious trophies of divine grace, we may and do safely conclude that the greatest, and most obdurate sinners are equally, with the least guilty, in the power of grace. If sin be in some instances so potent as to be beyond the power of God to arrest and destroy it; who can say but that sin may so fortify itself in the dominions of God as to brave the utmost power of Jehovah's arm, and extend its ravages even to the throne of God? Hence the word all, used by the apostle in his letter to Timothy, must be understood in a *restricted sense*. That it is in some measure restricted must be admitted; for otherwise it would embrace fallen angels. How do we know that it does not extend to them? The scripture assures us that he took not on him the nature of angels, and that there is no redemption for them. In the same way we learn from other portions of scripture, which we have before adduced, that Christ did not die for all the posterity of Adam; without any exception. The apostle is here to be understood as speaking of individuals of all nations, and not of all the individuals of every nation. Beza translates πας ανθρωπος, by a Latin word which signifies all kinds, some of all nations, states, and conditions. That this is the true sense of the phrase Calvin has proved by very solid reasoning. "The apostle," says he, "simply means that no nation, or order of men is excluded from the salvation, which God offers to all without exception who hear the gospel.—The universality here mentioned by Paul, must be referred to kinds of men, and not to persons; as if he had said not Jews only, but Gentiles also, not peasants only, but princes too are redeemed by Christ."

The world, for which Christ is said by the evangelist

John* to have died, and to which he was sent, cannot be extended without limitation to the whole human family; for innumerable multitudes of the world which it composes, perish; but it denotes, either the universality of the elect, or some of all people indiscriminately, Jews and Gentiles. The evangelist alludes to the promise made to Abraham "that in his (Christ's) seed, all families of the earth should be blessed."† In this promise given to the ancient patriarch, there are blessings held out to all nations, who have Abraham for their father.‡ But this blessing is not promised to all men universally, who are in the world, but to all the promised seed; without any distinction of nation; as appears both from this, that all will not be justified and saved by faith, according to the nature of the promise, as its blessing is explained by Paul;§ and that the same apostle limits it to those who are the seed of Abraham *through faith.*‖ Again the apostle quotes this passage from Genesis, "in Isaac shall thy seed be called,"¶ and thus limits the promise to a definite number. Hence the world for whom Christ gave his body to death,** is none other than the world to which he is said, verse 33, to give life. "This is the bread of God which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the *world*," which can not extend to the whole human family. For the giving of life imparts its application and communication; which are imparted to the elect only. It is in this sense, that Christ says he gives life to his sheep.†† It is absurd to say that life is given to one when it is only obtained for him or offered to him, but never applied to him. When Christ is said to be the "lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world,"‡‡ the elect world is meant. The word αἴρω, which is here translated taketh away, signifies to remove entirely. How can Christ be said to remove, or entirely take away the sins of the reprobate, which remain against

* John iii. 16, 17. and iv. 42. and vi. 33.
† Gen. xii. 3. and xxvi. 4. and xxii. 18.
‡ Rom. iv. 16.
§ Gal. iii. 8. 10.
‖ Rom. iv. 16.
¶ Rom. ix. 7.
** John vi. 5.
†† John x. 28.
‡‡ John i. 9.

them for condemnation? No other world can be meant in these passages but the world of the elect, made up out of Jews and Gentiles, without any regard to nation, or condition—the world of those whose sins Christ is said to have borne, in his own body on the tree, that they being dead to sin might live unto righteousness—* those who are said to be blessed, on account of the taking away of their sins.†

When it is said that, "Christ is a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but for the sins of the whole world," it is not meant to extend the propitiation, to all collectively and severally, but to those only, who can comfort themselves by the intercession of Christ, by that pardon which they have obtained through him. They are the elect only. Christ is a propitiation for those alone, whose cause he pleads, as intercessor with the Father; for these are joined together by the apostle as equal and inseparable. Our learned opponents confess, in *their* explanation of John xvii. 9. that Christ is not an advocate for all. Christ should actually appease and reconcile the Father to all those for whom he has made propitiation in his blood, unless we will maintain that Christ has missed his aim, and shed his blood in vain, contrary to the assertion of the apostle‡ that no one can be condemned for whom Christ died. Will it be said that he cannot be condemned, who is excluded from salvation, and on whom the wrath of God abides? Surely not. Finally, the scope of the apostle, which is, to comfort believers against the remains of sin, proves that he does intend every one of the posterity of Adam. Now what comfort can a believer take from that grace which is common to the elect, and the reprobate? What comfort if he knows that Christ in his death has done nothing more for him, than for unbelievers. Therefore the phrase of John has respect not to all men of all nations, but to the believing inhabitants of the whole world; or as Calvin speaks, "the sons of God dispersed through the whole world." Lest any one should think that the blessing

*2 Pet. ii. 24. †Psal. xxxii. 1. ‡Rom. viii. 34.

of Christ's atonement was confined to the apostles alone, or to those believers to whom this epistle was directed; John says that it was much more extensive, embracing men of all nations, and belonging to believers redeemed out of every tribe, tongue, kindred, and people of the whole world. It is of little moment whether by the phrase *our sins*, are understood those of the apostles, or those of believing Jews of the dispersion, then living (to whom, without doubt, this epistle was directed, while the epistles of Peter and James are called catholic, because not inscribed to any particular city or person) as distinguished from those who had believed before Christ appeared in the flesh, or from those who would afterwards believe to the end of the world. The question still comes to the same point. It is sufficient that the world here mentioned cannot embrace universally all men; as John and those to whom he writes were distinguished from it; while yet they are included in that universality, which embraces the whole of the human race. This was the opinion of Calvin. "Not for our sins only, says the apostle, by way of amplification, that believers might be firmly persuaded, that the propitiation extended to all who would embrace Christ by faith,"—and again, "the object of John was none other, but to make it known that the blessing of which he discourses is common to the whole church, therefore under *all* he does not comprehend the reprobate, but designates them who would afterwards believe from among those who were scattered over every clime. Then truly with the greatest propriety the grace of Christ is illustrated, when he is preached as the only salvation of the world."

Though Christ came to save that which was lost* and saves none others, yet it is not necessary that he should save all those who are lost sinners. So far from this, Christ himself clearly testifies, that he came not to call those lost sinners who are both utterly ignorant of their lost state and swollen with an exalted opinion of their own righteousness,

* Matt. xviii. 11.

but those only who labour and are heavy laden with the burden of their sin, perceiving its burden.* Whence he says, he came to save that which was lost, in order to mark the *character* and *condition* of those who will be saved, but not *all* that which was lost. He designates the quality, not the number of those whom he would save.

It is one thing to perish in reality, and that finally, another to receive from a brother an occasion by which he might perish, through the disorderly walk of a fellow-member of the church; and for any exertions which his brother makes to prevent him from perishing. When the apostle Paul speaks† concerning the perishing of a brother, for whom Christ died; he does not intend actual perdition, as if he meant to teach that one for whom Christ died might perish in reality, for none can snatch Christ's sheep out of his hand;‡ nor can any one of those perish whom the Father has given him, to be redeemed.§ "They are kept by the power of God through faith."‖ The apostle, when treating of a *brother*, cannot surely be understood to say that he shall finally perish; for though very weak in faith, he is yet established or stands by the assistance of the Lord.¶ The apostle intends to develope the mischievous consequences of an improper, and preposterous use of liberty in things which are in themselves indifferent, to shew that it wounds and offends the conscience of a weak brother, and thus gives an occasion, as far as in us lies, to his injury, and exposes him, as far as we can expose him, to the danger of perishing. The scriptures often use words which naturally signify effects and actions, when nothing more is intended, than to point out those occasions, and motives which may lead to the effects and actions mentioned. Thus he is said to be guilty, as far as in his power, of adultery, who only looks upon the wife of another man to lust after her.** He is said to "*make God a liar*, who believes not the record,

* Matt. xi. 28. † Rom. xiv. 15. and 1 Cor. viii. 10, 11. ‡ John x. 28.
§ John xvii. 12. ‖ 1 Pet. i. 5. ¶ Rom. xiv. 1—4. ** Matt. v. 28.

which God has given of his Son."* By which nothing more can be meant than that the unbeliever, does every thing in his power to make God a liar, or that he esteems God a liar. No one will say that he does so in reality. In this way a weak brother is said to perish by our knowledge, when we do nothing to preserve him; as it is expressed Rom. xiv. 15, "do not destroy thy weak brother by thy meat."

When heretical, apostate teachers are said "to deny the Lord that bought them;"† we are not to understand the buying to mean that kind of purchase which is made by paying a price to divine justice, and thus redeeming the sinner from the wrath and curse of God, and from eternal death. No one is so redeemed, but those who were given by the Father to Christ to be redeemed, and who consequently will be kept by Christ and saved with an everlasting salvation, as the members of his body and his peculiar treasure. It is respecting deliverance from error and idolatry that Peter here speaks—a deliverance effected by an outward exhibition of the gospel, and a setting apart to the ministry, for which these false teachers were in a certain respect bought by Christ as Lord of the church. Christ had acquired a peculiar title to them, as his own, by calling them into his church, the house which he owns, as masters formerly bought servants for the discharge of domestic duties. That this is the intention of Peter is collected from the following considerations:—1. He uses the word δεσπότης, which signifies a master or an owner rather than a Saviour, to which redemption properly so called belongs. 2. The word ἀγοράζειν is that which the apostle here employs to express the buying that he intends, and it is used generally to express that kind of buying which is practised in markets, and often to express simple deliverance. 3. The kind of buying here contemplated, is that through which those bought, are said "to have escaped the corruptions that are in the world." v. 20.—and this, "through the knowledge of God our Saviour," by which "they have known the way of righteous-

* 1 John v. 10. † 2 Pet. ii. 1.

ness. All these belong to deliverance from pagan errors and idolatries, and to a calling to the knowledge of the truth, from which, through apostacy and the introduction of most pernicious heresies, they make defection. Hence they are said to deny their master who bought them, and called them to the work of the ministry. 4. The denying of the Lord here mentioned, is a sin which is spoken of as peculiarly aggravated; and that which constitutes the peculiar aggravation is, that they deny their master who bought them. But if Peter intends by the purchase here mentioned, that atonement which Christ in his death made for sin, then there was nothing in the conduct of these teachers peculiarly wicked; the same thing might be affirmed of every man, upon the hypothesis of our opponents; for they maintain that he bought every man. On the supposition, however, that the buying here intended is the calling of these false teachers out of the darkness of heathen superstitions, to a knowledge of the glorious gospel of God, and making them teachers of that gospel; then their denial of a master who had done such great things for them, was a crime aggravated by the foulest ingratitude.

Sanctification by the blood of the covenant may be understood, in a twofold sense. One internal, spiritual, and real, which belongs to those who are actually redeemed and regenerated by the blood of Christ: another external and apparent only, which consists in a profession of the truth. The former necessarily presupposes that Christ died for those who are thus sanctified. The latter kind of sanctification does not presuppose this at all. Many hypocrites obtain that internal sanctification, by an external calling to membership in the church, and the enjoyment of its privileges, especially baptism and the Lord's Supper; to whom, notwithstanding, Christ with his saving benefits does not belong; because they are destitute of justifying faith. When Paul speaks of those who profane the blood of the covenant (testament) wherewith they had been sanctified;* we

* Heb. x. 29.

cannot suppose (upon the hypothesis of the Reformed churches) that he intends the internal and real sanctification of which we have spoken. We must understand him to mean external sanctification, such as belongs to those who profess their adherence to the church and a belief of the doctrines of the gospel, and who enjoy its ordinances, especially baptism, by which they are sanctified, or set apart from the world, by the sprinkling of water which represents the blood of the covenant, and who renounce it by denying Christ and apostatizing from his gospel. In this manner, those who eat and drink unworthily, at the sacrament of the supper, are said to be guilty of the body and blood of Christ.* Besides, the apostle speaks hypothetically, not absolutely. He points out the connection between an antecedent and consequent. He shows those, who thus transgress, what they are to expect. He asserts nothing more respecting those who are really redeemed and true believers, than what is elsewhere asserted respecting himself and angels from heaven.† "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other doctrine, let him be accursed." But no one will infer from this, that the apostle, or an angel from heaven will be accursed.

What every one is bound to believe absolutely and simply, directly and immediately, without any thing previously supposed, we grant is true. But the case is different in relation to those things which one is bound to believe mediately, and in consequence of some acts supposed to be previously done. It is false, however, that all men are bound to believe that Christ died for them simply and absolutely. In the first place, those to whom Christ has never been preached, to whom he has never been made known, are not surely bound to believe that Christ died for them. This can be affirmed of those only who are called in the gospel. "How can they believe in him of whom they have not heard, and how can they hear without a preacher?"‡ Secondly, even all those who hear the gospel are not bound to believe directly

* 1 Cor. xi. 27. 29. † Gal. i. 8. ‡ Rom. x. 14.

and immediately, that Christ died for them, but mediately. The acts of faith and repentance are presupposed; they must precede a belief that Christ died for one's self; for Christ's death belongs to those only who believe and repent. So far is it from being true that unbelievers are bound to believe that Christ died for them, that he who persuades them so to believe, mocks them in a solemn manner, while the wrath of God abides on them, and they are bound to believe themselves condemned already.* Nor if they are bound to believe that Christ will be found to have died for them, provided they will believe, does it follow that this is simply and absolutely true whether they believe or not. Hence those who are bound to believe that Christ died for them, are not simply and absolutely all men; it is all those only who are weary and heavy laden with their sins;† all who thirst and sensibly feel their need of drink;‡ or those who are penitent and feel their misery.

It will not avail here to object, "that faith in Christ is demanded of all who hear the gospel, and that not an undefined faith, but a faith true and justifying, and that it cannot be true and justifying unless it terminates on Christ as dying for them." For although faith in Christ is so demanded, and that true and justifying faith, yet we may not infer that it is required that all its acts are immediately and at the same time to be exercised; and especially its ultimate and special act, that of believing in Christ as having died for me. For although this is included in the acts of justifying faith; yet it is not its first act which is immediately and in the first instance demanded of the person called in the gospel: it is its last, and presupposes others preceding it. That this remark may be well understood, I shall proceed to distinguish various acts of faith. First, one act of faith is direct, which has for its object the offer of the gospel. By this act of faith I embrace his promises. Again another act of faith is reflex, and has for its object the direct act of faith. By this act I discover that I have indeed believed, and that the promises of the gospel belong to me. The direct act

* John iii. 36. † Matt. xi. 28. ‡ Isai. lxi. 1.

of faith is twofold. One of its operations consists in the assent which it gives to the word of God and the promises of the gospel, as true in relation to the giving of salvation to all who repent, and by a living faith fly to Christ and embrace him. Another operation of saving faith is its taking refuge and trusting in Christ, acknowledging him as the only sufficient saviour. It is by this we fly to him, rest in him, and from him obtain pardon of our sins and salvation. Now that faith which is commanded in the gospel is commanded as to the first and second acts which are direct, before it is commanded as to the third act which is the reflex, and which necessarily supposes the two former; as the latter cannot exist unless as preceded by the former. Hence we are enabled clearly to detect the fallacy of the above objection. When the objection speaks of the faith commanded, it refers to that act by which the sinner lays hold of Christ; but when it speaks of the thing believed, then it refers to the last, by which we believe from the evidence of the direct act in our souls, that Christ died for us. Christ is not revealed in the gospel as having died for me in particular; but only in general, as having died for those who believe and repent. Hence I reason, from that faith and repentance which I find actually to exist in my heart, that Christ has, indeed, died for me in particular. I know that he died for all who fly to him; I find that I have fled to him; hence I can and should infer, that he died for me. That the faith commanded in the gospel is not a direct and immediate belief that Christ died for me, appears from this consideration: that when it is enjoined, either by Christ or his apostles, no mention is made of its being applied to this or that man, in particular. Mention is made only of a general relation to duty, or to blessings promised to those who believe; as in Matt. xvi. 16. Peter, in that celebrated declaration of his faith, professes no more than this: "*that he believes Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of the living God.*" John vi. 69. "We believe and are sure, that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Paul demands* no more of those who believe

* Rom. x. 9.

unto salvation, than "to confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus, and to believe with the heart that God raised him from the dead." Thus when the saints are commanded to believe in the Son of God, they are bound indeed to believe that Christ is the true Messiah, and to fly to him as the sole and only author of salvation, as one, who through faith and repentance, will receive them to himself; and these acts must take place before they are bound to believe that Christ died for them.

Hence it appears, that the command to believe in Christ, embraces many things before we come to the last consolatory act, by which we believe that he died for us. First, we are to believe what the scripture reveals to us, relative to our miserable condition, by nature, and the utter inability to effectuate our own salvation. Whence arise despair of salvation through our own exertions, and a knowledge of the necessity of a remedy. Secondly, those who thus despair of themselves, are commanded to believe, that Christ the only Son of God, is the alone all-sufficient Saviour, given by God to men—that in him alone, they can obtain perfect salvation and remission of sin, and that all who led by right views, fly to him and repent with genuine repentance, will obtain salvation. Thirdly, those who are thus contrite and penitent, and despairing in themselves, are commanded to betake themselves by flight to Christ, as the rock of salvation, to his merits as all-sufficient, to repose in him their confidence, and sweetly rest in it; and through it alone expect to obtain remission of sin, righteousness and salvation. Fourthly, and finally, those who perceive that they have repented, do repent, fly to Christ by faith, and repose in him all their hopes of salvation, are bound to believe that Christ died for them, and that on account of his death their sins are pardoned. From all which, it is abundantly plain, that faith in Christ, presupposes an afflicting sense of misery and a desire of deliverance—and that the command to believe, does not respect all immediately, but only all who feel their misery and desire deliverance from it—all who hunger and thirst—all who labour and are heavy laden—and who are broken in spirit,

and contrite in heart.* Further, it appears, that this gospel command, does not immediately, and in the first instance, demand of us that act of faith, by which we believe that Christ died for us, but that by which we fly to Christ, embrace him, and rest on him, which is nothing else but the motion by which the penitent sinner, dejected under a sense of his misery, all confidence and hope of remedy in himself being renounced, and awakened by the call of the gospel, flies to Christ as the rock of salvation, and with his whole heart desires and seeks the grace offered in the gospel. That I may express it in one word, the faith which the gospel demands of those who hear it is, *the flying of the sinner for refuge to God as the fountain of grace, and to Christ as the ark of safety which is opened in the gospel.* If I am conscious to myself that I have done this, which is the formal act of faith, then I can and ought to exercise the act of faith, by which I believe, that for me, who repent, and fly to him, Christ hath died. This is sometimes called the *consequent* act of faith, because it is consequent upon, or follows the direct act of faith, by which I believe in Christ, and fly to him as the only and perfect Saviour. It is also called the consolatory act, because it pours into the soul of the believer unspeakable joy and consolation. Since, therefore, no one can have this special reflex act of faith, unless repentance, and the other acts are presupposed as going before it; we infer, that all are not bound to believe that Christ died for them, but believers, penitents only, or all who, through the knowledge of sin, and a sense of the divine wrath, are contrite in heart, and fly to him, and from him seek pardon of sin, and rely on the merits of his intercession and atonement for grace and salvation.

In vain will any one reply, "that the command to believe in Christ calls for a faith embracing all its acts, and among them the last, by which we believe that Christ died for us, for me; and that this is demanded of all who hear the gospel, and are by it required to believe." The nature and de-

* Matt. xi. 28. and Isai. lxi. 1.

pendence of these acts upon one another, is such, that the last cannot exist without the former; the third cannot exist without the second, nor the second without the first. When therefore, the command to believe is announced, the first act is demanded of the sinner; not that he may halt there, but that having performed it, he may go on to the second. But in case he has not performed the first, he is by no means required to go on to the second. He cannot, nay he ought not to believe, that Christ is his Redeemer, who does not believe that Christ is the Son of God, and the Redeemer of men. This would bind a man to believe that Christ redeems him, while yet he does not believe that there is any Christ a Redeemer: but, when a man finds in himself the preceding acts, which are the foundation of the last, then, and not till then, let him go on to exercise that last consolatory act.

A second objection, equally unsubstantial, is, "that as many as are commanded to believe in Christ, are commanded to have justifying faith, as no other can be saving; but justifying faith necessarily imports a particular application, that we believe not only that Christ died in common for men, but for us in particular: that otherwise, this faith would not differ from the mere historical faith of reprobates, nay, it would not differ from the faith of devils who can believe the same thing." To this I reply, that justifying faith which is commanded in the gospel, does indeed embrace the various acts of which we have spoken, but every one in its own order. First, the direct and formal act, which consists in the last judgment of the practical intellect, or that by which the will is immediately impelled to volition. The understanding, the will co-operating with it, decides concerning Christ, that he is the sole and only Redeemer of all those who believe, repent, and seriously fly to him. This is called justifying faith. In it the light let into the understanding, powerfully impels the will, and the whole soul flies for refuge to Christ and finds rest. The second and reflex act, spontaneously in some cases, and in others by serious examination, follows this first appropriating and justifying act. From the time that I feel myself powerfully persuaded by the gospel

call and promises, seriously to fly to Christ, seek righteousness, and expect life from him alone, from that moment I can infer, and have a right to infer, that Christ has died for me; because, from the gospel I learn, that he has died for all who believe and repent. Hence the answer to the argument is easy. Whosoever is bound to have justifying faith, is bound to believe that Christ died for him. This is the argument. Now I deny that this is true of the first act of faith. In the second reflex act, I admit it to be true. Presuppose the first, then we are bound to believe that Christ died for us; exclude the first and direct act, then I deny that any man is so bound. After all, the faith of believers is entirely different from that of reprobates and devils. For although reprobates may believe theoretically, that Christ is the Son of God and Saviour of men, yet they are never so truly and really persuaded by a fiducial and cordial assent to the word of God, that they fly to him and rest upon him for salvation. If they were truly and practically persuaded, that Christ is the only, and perfect Saviour of all who believe and repent, and that out of him there is no salvation, it would be impossible for them not to fly to him and embrace him for salvation with their whole heart. This necessity arises from the will's always obeying the last practical dictate of the understanding, and from all creatures seeking their own happiness. Hence also it appears, that the faith of devils has nothing in common with that of the elect. Devils know that Christ is offered to men alone, and that they have no interest in him; and it is utterly impossible for them to place any fiducial reliance upon him.

Again, it is objected, "that no one can place his trust and reliance upon Christ, unless he knows that Christ has died for him, and is his Saviour. For man always hesitates, and is anxious about his salvation, until he knows the intentions of God and will of Christ; and that by the purpose of God the death of Christ was destined for him." To this I reply, that there are two acts, or parts, in the fiducial reliance of the Christian. The one consists in his receiving and taking refuge in Christ; the other, in the rest and consolation which

arise from a sense of having fled to and received Christ. The former is the act of faith, by which we fly to Christ as the only Saviour, cleave to him, apply, and appropriate him to ourselves for salvation. It is by the latter act that, flying to Christ and resting on him, we believe and trust that we have, and to eternity will have communion with him in his death and its benefits; and in him joyfully acquiesce, certainly persuaded that he died for us, and that by his death we are reconciled to God. Some divines have called the former *faith on Christ*, and the latter *faith respecting Christ*. This respects Christ as having died for us; not so the former; for no one can know that Christ has died for him, unless he has first believed on him. As Christ is promised to those only who believe and repent, I must first fly to him and embrace his merits with genuine repentance, before I can on good grounds decide, that the death of Christ belongs to me by the decree of God, and the intention of Christ. My faith however, does not cause that Christ died for me; for his death was antecedent to any regard had to faith as its meritorious cause, and the grace of faith is a fruit and effect of the death of Christ. But it is an evidence in all those who possess it, that Christ died for them. We infer the existence of the cause from the effect. And though I cannot yet assure myself that Christ has died for me, it does not follow that I must always remain in a state of doubt and anxiety, and that my faith must be weak and unstable. My faith may firmly rest upon those general promises of the gospel, which promise salvation to every believing and penitent sinner. Hence by certain consequence, when I find that I possess faith and repentance, I may assure myself that these promises belong to me.

Another objection is offered to this effect, "that, from our hypothesis, the foundation of the sinner's consolation is taken away, as we reason from a particular to a universal; thus, Christ died for some, therefore, he died for me. But by the rules of good reasoning, we should proceed from a universal to a particular;—Christ died for all men and and every man, therefore, he died for me." But this is gra-

tuitous, that is, every one knows that it is foolish and absurd to reason in this manner. We deny that we do so. We reason from a universal to a particular, but in a certain order. Christ died for all who believe and repent, but I believe and repent, therefore, he died for me. It is false that any ground of consolation can be drawn from the absolute universality of Christ's death; for that which is common to the godly and ungodly, to those who shall be saved, and the innumerable multitudes, who have been and shall be damned, can surely afford no solid comfort to any one. If it be supposed that Christ died for Judas and Pharaoh, who have perished notwithstanding, how will, how can this free me from the fear of damnation? If you reply, that this fear may be taken away by faith, you recur to the same chain of reasoning upon which our consolation rests. You will say, all who believe and repent shall be saved; I believe, and therefore I shall be saved; "for whosoever believeth on the Son shall not perish, but have everlasting life." This is our mode of reasoning. It does not elicit comfort from the universality of the atonement, but from faith's laying hold of the atonement by an act of appropriation. No solid peace can be extracted from that which is insufficient for salvation, from an atonement which avails not, and which of itself cannot prevent damnation. And such is that universal grace for which our opponents contend,—a grace which is never effectually applied to the sinner. What will it avail the sinner to know that Christ hath died for all, while it is certain, that, without faith, no one will ever become a partaker of the fruits of his death? Will he not be in a state of doubt and anxious hesitation, to know whether he belongs to the number of those to whom faith will be given. He knows it will not be given to all, and he will be anxious to know, whether he shall be made a partaker of it. May not the same difficulties and scruples which can be urged against special grace, and a special atonement, be also urged against a special decree of bestowing faith? If, therefore, solid peace of conscience can never be attained but by the mercy of God the Father towards all, and a universal atonement

by the Son, neither can this peace of conscience be attained, but by a universal calling, and a universal operation of the Spirit, effectually applying the universal salvation. If the sinner anxiously doubt and say, who knows whether Christ, since he has not died for all, has died for me; may he not also doubt and say, who knows and can tell me, whether God will give me faith, and whether I am of the number of the elect or of the reprobate? Besides all such scruples originate from a desire to know what is not given to man to know, at least, not in the way in which these people seek to know it. It becomes no mortal to institute a scrutiny, *a priori*, into the secrets of the divine decree, relative to election and reprobation. In such enquiries as these into a man's present state, and future prospects, he should proceed *a posteriori*, by examining himself, in order to discover whether he has truly repented of his sins or not. If he has, he may, and ought to assure himself of the *grace of God*, and *his* own election. If he find that he has not repented, he ought, without delay, to apply himself to the use of the means which God has appointed;—he ought to hear and read the word, and pour out ardent prayers to God, to bestow upon him the gifts of faith and repentance; and in all those duties he should engage with profound meditation. Nor can any scruples occur on this subject, which our learned opponents are not as much bound to remove as we; except the Arminians, who maintain, that every man has, of himself, through the universal grace of God, sufficient power to believe and repent. But from this Pelagian dogma, those against whom we have reasoned in this chapter, have, through the grace of God, professed themselves free. The foundation of consolation therefore, is to be sought, not from the universality of the atonement, but from the universality of the promises to all who believe and repent.

Although the reprobates who do not believe the gospel, will be deservedly condemned for their unbelief, yet it does not follow, that they were commanded to believe that Christ had died for them. There are various kinds of unbelief besides that of not believing that the atonement was made for

them, such as, not believing that Jesus is the Son of God, and the Messiah sent by God, but that he was a false prophet, and an impostor; or the not believing that faith is a condition necessary to salvation. All these are acts of unbelief, and that of a very criminal nature, though those who are guilty of them, may never have thought of Christ's dying for them. That faith which Christ so often demands, and for the want of which, he so severely reprehends the Jews, embraces in itself many things, many acts, which must have preceded their belief, that Christ was their Saviour and Redeemer. This, indeed, was far from the first thing which the Jew was to believe: he could not have believed it at first. He must first have believed that salvation was not to be obtained by the law, either in its ceremonies or legal works—that it was to be sought in that Messiah alone, who is promised in the prophets—that Jesus of Nazareth is that Messiah—and that all will be saved who believe in him. All these general acts of faith must have preceded the belief that Christ had died for him. Nor should it be replied, that all these acts are comprehended in the command to believe on Christ, and, above all, the special, appropriating act. As we have said above, though all these are commanded, yet it is in a certain order, and the latter are not commanded in any other way than as preceded by the former; and, on the supposition of the first acts not having been performed, it is impossible for the latter to exist.

Though God, by the preaching of the gospel, offers Christ to sinners, it does not follow, that he must have died for all those to whom he is thus offered, or otherwise, that the offer cannot be sincere. Because the offer is not absolute and completely unconditional, but it is made under the condition of faith and repentance. The gospel offer does narrate facts which are true, whether they are believed or not. I confine this to what the gospel says with respect to the sinner. It does not say to the sinner, Christ has died for you, and you shall be saved on account of this death, whether you believe or not. But, as Camerus speaks, it informs

the sinner, that salvation is procured by the death of Christ for all who believe—that this salvation has been procured by the death of Christ—and that by embracing it in faith, the sinner will find this to be a consolatory truth. From which it is inferrible that there is an indissoluble connection between faith and salvation,—that the hearers are bound to exercise faith, when called in the gospel,—and that, if they wish to be saved through faith, this is the only way in which they can attain to it. But from this gospel call, we by no means rightly infer, that God, by his eternal and immutable decree, has destined Christ to be the Saviour of all who are called, or that he intended, that Christ, by his death, should acquire salvation for all men and every man, or even for all those who hear the gospel. The gospel which is preached to those who are called, does not declare that, in the eternal decree of God, it has been ordained, that in Christ, redemption has been procured for all men and every man. It rather announces to sinners a divine command, makes known their duty, and teaches that, through the medium of the performance of this duty, they shall be made partakers of salvation. We must not suppose hence, that such an offer as this is adverse to the divine decree. Because, though it does not answer to the decree of election, yet it answers to the decree respecting the means of saving those who are elected. In the decree of election, God set apart Christ as the Saviour of those whom he elected, and ordained his death to be the price of their redemption; and determined to bestow upon them that faith which should enable them to embrace the salvation procured by this death. To this decree, the internal, saving operations of the Spirit answer—they are its fulfilment and execution. In the decree respecting the means of salvation, God was pleased to connect Christ and faith together, and to offer Christ to the hearers of the gospel. The preaching of the gospel corresponds with, and is the execution of this decree. It is of this decree that Christ speaks, when he says,* "and this is the will of him that

* John vi. 40.

sent me, that every one who seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." Promises thus conditional, made to those who believe and repent, unfold the connection which God has established between faith and salvation; and make known that those hearers only of the gospel shall be saved who believe and repent. They, however, no more shew that Christ died for all the hearers of the gospel, than that they shall all believe and obtain pardon of sin. From the remission which they obtain who believe and repent, it is proved that Christ died for them; and it would also be true, if others believed and repented, that Christ had died for them. But he who reasons that Christ has died for all, if they will only believe, reasons falsely; from hypothetical premises, he draws an absolute conclusion, contrary to all good rules of reasoning.

APPENDIX.

THERE are two societies of professed Christians, which have not been noticed in the Historical Sketch, as they at present exist, in the United States—the Swedenburghians and the Roman Catholics. The former of these, have three or four ministers in this country, all of whom are, in a great measure, illiterate. It is believed, that none of them has any pretensions, even to a smattering of classical literature, or physical science. There has been for several years, a society of the disciples of Swedenburgh, organised in the city of Baltimore; and they have lately organised a small one in Philadelphia, and erected a New Jerusalem Temple, as it is pompously announced in the newspapers. There is one preacher in the western part of New-York State, and one in Ohio. There are, besides, several small societies in other parts of the union.

The exertions made by these people, to diffuse their principles, are prodigious, considering their numbers. They have published magazines, pamphlets and books, all of which are stuffed with selections from the works of the founder of the sect. Many of them are distributed gratuitously, among the poorer and middling classes of society. It is said, that several thousand dollars, have been expended in the city of Philadelphia alone, in this way. They have even presented to one of the rival chiefs of Hayti, a considerable number of their books, and contemplate a similar offering to the other. Will the friends of truth awake?

Since the Historical Sketch went to press, the author has been informed, that while Clowes, and many other Swedenburghians of England, remain in the Episcopal church, there is also a separate society formed, consisting of several congregations.

Many people attend at their temple on Sabbath, who do not yet embrace their notions. Most of these visitants are of the episcopal church; indeed, by far the greater part of their converts, both in England and America, are from that body. As in Britain, so in America, few of the poor join their society. They wish to be rich in heaven, though they are poor in this world. Those who have a taste for luxurious living, and the means of gratifying it, are enamoured with the "nectarious wines," and splendid festivals of Swedenburgh's heaven. This will probably account for their making so many proselytes in the episcopal church, in which there are so much gaiety, and fashion, and worldly spirit.

They have published, in Philadelphia, a manual for the direction of their public worship, of which the forms are, in a great measure, copied from the prayer book of the protestant episcopal church, resembling in form that instrument as much as the child generally resembles the parent. It also embraces an account of their creed. In their enumeration of the "Complete Holy Scriptures," they leave out of the Old Testament, the two books of Chronicles, the books of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, and the Song of Solomon; and out of the New, the Acts of the Apostles, and all the Epistles. For this omission, they do not pretend to have any other authority than that of Swedenburgh, who tells them that the exploded books, were not written according to "the science of correspondences." Why the Baron proscribed so much of the Old Testament, is not very manifest; but the reason is plain, for the act of exile passed against Paul and the other apostles; the doctrines of the atonement, and divine decrees, are so clearly asserted by them, that the most commodious way of answering all arguments drawn from their Epistles, is to deny that they are a part of the divine word. Priestley rejected those parts of the Bible which did not suit his purpose. To give all this the most gentle name, it is semi-infidelity. They deny the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

The doctrine of the atonement, is not in the Swedenburghian confession of faith. The object of Christ's incar-

nation, according to this confession, was to subdue hell. And the object of his sufferings, they say was, "to unite his divinity with his divine humanity." They maintain, that all men have an influx from heaven, and that by using it well, they may save themselves. This influx is the "internal light" of the Quaker, the moral power of the Arminian, and the natural ability of the Hopkinsian.

The Roman Catholics make very great efforts to increase the number of avowed devotees to the see of Rome, and their success is very considerable. They have three colleges, one in Georgetown, one in Baltimore, and one at Emmetsburgh, in the interior of Maryland. The most conspicuous and influential of these institutions, is St. Mary's of Baltimore, under the care of the society of St. Sulpicius. This college was powerfully supported for many years. Its directors had a connection with the Catholics of Louisiana, and with those of Canada. But the illiberal means which they employed to make all their pupils Catholics, and the reputation of an opposition college, under the care of the Rev. Dr. Knox, have very much crippled this American "Man of Sin." Yet the number of chapels which are erected or erecting, in every section of the union, evince, that both their numbers and their wealth are very great, and that they are on the increase. Scarcely any opposition is made to them. Indeed, it seems to be a prevailing opinion, that it is a matter of perfect indifference, what religion a man embraces, or what doctrines he believes, provided his heart is good, and his morals decent. Few pray the prayer of David: "Let my heart be sound in thy *statutes*." The connection between theory and practice, is not well understood; nor is a regard for the honour of God, as displayed in a firm attachment to all known truth, a very prominent feature of modern professors. The cry of all is union.

The feelings and opinions of the day, have been embodied in Dr. Mason's Catholic Communion, mentioned in our Historical Sketch. The difficulties in which this subject is involved, appear in the most striking light, from this volume. We are astonished that, in the hands of such a writer, it is

found to be so unmanageable. Though he would not extend the operation farther than we have mentioned in the Sketch, yet all the arguments which he offers, either prove nothing, or they prove much more, than the writer intends. If there are Christians, and who will doubt that there are, among the Methodists, and Roman Catholics; on his principles, Presbyterian sessions must admit them to the Lord's table, so soon as they exhibit testimonials, which, in a judgment of charity, establish their claims to piety of heart. All Baptists, Hopkinsians, Episcopalians, &c. of pious character, must also be admitted. Nay, much more, all must, even with their present opinions and practices, unite in the strictest bonds of church communion. Is this possible? How could Baptists and Presbyterians harmonize on the subject of infant baptism, when they would come to practical operations? How could any of them unite in the same judicatory, with Episcopalians? It would produce more *confusion* than that at the tower of Babel.

What then? Abandon the object altogether? Surely not. Let all, who love our Lord Jesus Christ, love each other, discuss their differences with candour, and say *to* each other from the pulpit and the press, and in social intercourse, what they say *of* each other among their own connections. Probe the wound, lay open the sore, and then heal it. But if you attempt to heal it, while disease lurks in the bottom, it will break out with tenfold virulence. To produce unity of action, and co-operation of plan, when opinions, and feelings, and practices are adverse, is as impossible in morals, as to harmonize, in physics, adverse elements. As Mr. M'Master has well expressed it, in his excellent Essay in Defence of some of the Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity; "A war more fierce than before, from the approximation to each other of the contending elements," would be produced by such a union. Let all pray that a spirit of illumination may be poured out from on high, upon the church of God,—that "the light of the sun may become as the light of seven days,"—and that "the watchmen may *see*

eye to eye." When this takes place, then, and not till then, "the Lord will build again the waste places of Zion."

The following extract, from the Constitution of the Theological seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian church, was omitted in the Historical Sketch.

"No student shall be admitted into the seminary, unless he have previously graduated in some college, or university; but the supreme judicatory may direct the superintendents to admit such applicants, as, upon examination, are found to possess literary qualifications equivalent to those which usually entitle a student of college to the first degree in the arts."

"The course of instruction shall occupy four successive annual sessions, and each session shall be of six months continuance; from the first of November to the first of May. The whole course shall be divided into three several parts, appropriated to three distinct classes, the first, the second, and the third, into any one of which, students duly qualified may be admitted."

"The first class shall be called the *class of Biblical literature*, and in it shall the student, during the first session, attend, in order that he may be qualified for *understanding* the sacred text."

"The students of this class shall be instructed in the languages of both the Old and the New Testaments, and in the cognate dialects, reading such portions of the Greek classics, as shall be prescribed for them: They shall attend, twice in each week, Lectures on History. It shall be the duty of the professor to condense into fifty-two lectures, the outlines of history, sacred and profane, from the beginning of the world till the (then) present time; following the line of prophecy, and connecting civil with ecclesiastical history, referring the students to the proper authorities, and directing them to consult other explanatory historians."

"The second shall be called the *class of pulpit eloquence*, and in it shall the student, during the second session attend, in order to qualify him for *expounding*, in a persuasive manner, the oracles of God. It shall be the duty of the professor to deliver to this class a course of lectures on metaphysics, (including the science of the human mind and Christian experience,) on logic, on ethics, (including political morality,) and on elocution, and the method of sermonizing, giving a corresponding direction to their reading."

"The third shall be called the *class of systematic and polemic theology*, and in it shall the student, during the third and fourth sessions, attend in order to establish him in the analogy of faith, and enable him to resist gainsayers. It shall be the duty of the professor to deliver to this class a series of lectures on Divinity, pursuing the plan laid down in the declaratory part of "Reformation Principles exhibited," (the Testimony of the church) and directing the students to peruse and compare, the Confession of the Reformed churches, together with the most approved systems of theology. The whole course must not exceed the number of one hundred and four lectures."

"All the students throughout the several classes shall be directed to attend occasionally to reading Hebrew, and other oriental languages; they shall also pay attention to sacred criticism, compose dissertations, and deliver discourses, as the professor of theology shall see meet to direct them, and they shall deliver discourses in public, at the annual examination, before the board of superintendents."

"No candidate shall be licensed to preach the gospel by any of the judicatories of the Reformed Presbyterian church, after the organization of this seminary, unless he produce a regular certificate of his having attended with approbation to the course of instruction prescribed for the two last years, or exhibit such testimonials as shall, in the opinion of the court, prove equivalent."

This excellent course of theological education has been pursued, and the plan substantially filled up by the Rev.

Dr. Wylie, since the seminary went into operation, in 1810. May the great prophet of the church pour out his spirit to enlighten, and sanctify our schools of theology, and make the sons of the prophets able and faithful ministers of the New Testament.